PLAINTIFFS' MEMORANDUM IN OPPOSITION TO DEFENDANTS' MOTION TO EXCLUDE EXPERT TESTIMONY OF THOMAS MCGUIRE

EXHIBIT F

THOMAS MCGUIRE DEPOSITION TRANSCRIPT (09/09/2020).

	Page 1
1	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
	FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF WEST VIRGINIA
2	
3	* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *
4	
5	THE CITY OF HUNTINGTON,
6	Plaintiff,
6	vs. CIVIL ACTION
7	NO. 3:17-01362
	AMERISOURCEBERGEN DRUG
8	CORPORATION, et al.,
9	Defendants.
10	
11	CABELL COUNTY COMMISSION,
12	Plaintiff,
13	vs. CIVIL ACTION
1 /1	NO. 3:17-01665
14	AMERISOURCEBERGEN DRUG CORPORATION, et al.,
15	CORFORATION, et al.,
	Defendants.
16	
	* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *
17	
18	
19	Videotaped and videoconference deposition
	of THOMAS MCGUIRE taken by the Defendants under the
20	Federal Rules of Civil Procedure in the above-
0.4	entitled action, pursuant to notice, before Teresa
21	S. Evans, a Registered Merit Reporter, all parties
2.2	located remotely, on the 9th day of September,
22 23	2020.
23 24	
∠ I	

	Page 2
1 2	APPEARANCES:
	APPEARING FOR THE PLAINTIFFS:
3	Michael Pendell, Esquire
4	David D. Burnett, Esquire Anne McGinness Kearse, Esquire
5	John Hurst, Esquire MOTLEY RICE
6	28 Bridgeside Boulevard Mt. Pleasant, SC 29464
7	
8	David Ko, Esquire KELLER ROHRBACK LLP 1201 Third Avenue, Suite 3200
9 10	Seattle, WA 98101
11	APPEARING FOR THE DEFENDANT CARDINAL HEALTH:
12	J. Andrew Keyes, Esquire WILLIAMS & CONNOLLY 725 Twelfth Street, N.W.
13	Washington, DC 20005
14	Raymond Franks, Esquire
1 7	CAREY, DOUGLAS, KESSLER & RUBY
15	901 Chase Tower 707 Virginia Street, East
16 17	Charleston, WV 25323
	APPEARING FOR THE DEFENDANT AMERISOURCEBERGEN:
18	
19	Cliff Breese, Esquire (morning) Alyssa Conn, Esquire (afternoon)
20	REED SMITH
20	Three Logan Square 1717 Arch Street, Suite 3100
21 22 23 24	Philadelphia, PA, 19103

```
Page 3
 1
                     APPEARANCES (Contd.):
 2
     ALSO PRESENT:
 3
               Adam Hager, Videographer
               Justin Taylor, Esquire (via Zoom)
 4
 5
 6
 7
 8
 9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
2 4
```

					Page 4	
1				EXAMINATION INDEX		
2						
3	E	3Y	MR.	KEYES		8
4	E	3Y	MR.	KO	146	
5						
6						
7						
8						
9						
10						
11						
12						
13						
14						
15						
16						
17						
18						
19						
20						
21						
22						
23						
24						
	l					

1 PROCEEDINGS

2.4

VIDEO OPERATOR: Good morning. We are going on the record at 9:04 a.m. on September 9th, 2020. Please note that the microphones are sensitive and may pick up whispering, private conversations and cellular interference. Please turn off all cell phones or place them away from the microphones as they can interfere with the deposition audio.

Audio and video recording will continue to take place unless all parties agree to go off the record.

This is Media Unit 1 of the video recorded deposition of Tom McGuire taken by counsel for the Defendant in the matter of the City of Huntington and Cabell County Commission versus AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, et al, filed in the United States District Court for the Southern District of West Virginia, being Civil Action Nos. 3:17-01362 and 3:17-01665.

This deposition is being conducted remotely via Zoom conferencing. My name is Adam Hager from the firm Veritext and I'm the videographer. The court reporter is Teresa Evans

1 | from the firm Veritext.

2.3

2.4

I am not authorized to administer an oath; I am not related to any party in this action; nor am I financially interested in the outcome.

Counsel and all present and everyone attending remotely will now state their appearances and affiliations for the record.

If there are any objections to proceeding, please state them at the time of your appearance, beginning with the noticing attorney.

MR. KEYES: Andrew Keyes with the law firm of Williams & Connolly on behalf of Cardinal Health.

MR. PENDELL: Go ahead. The other defendants want to go before I go or what?

MR. FRANKS: Yeah, this is -- I'm

sorry, I'll go ahead. I'm running a little slow this morning.

Also on behalf of Cardinal Health as local counsel in Charleston, West Virginia, for the firm of Carey, Kessler -- Carey Douglas Kessler and Ruby, this is Ray Franks.

MR. BREESE: This is Cliff Breese from Reed Smith on behalf of ABDC.

	Page 7
1	MR. KEYES: Anyone for McKesson?
2	MR. PENDELL: This is Mike Pendell,
3	Motley Rice, for the Plaintiffs.
4	MR. HURST: This is John Hurst with
5	Motley Rice for the Plaintiffs.
6	MR. KO: Oh, go ahead, John. Good
7	morning everyone. Bright and early from the West
8	Coast, this is David Ko, Keller Rohrback, also on
9	behalf of the Plaintiffs.
10	MR. BURNETT: And David Burnett from
11	Motley Rice on behalf of Plaintiffs.
12	MR. KEYES: Anyone else?
13	MS. KEARSE: Anne Kearse is also on
1 4	for the Plaintiffs.
15	VIDEO OPERATOR: If there are no
16	further appearances to be noted, would the court
17	reporter please swear the witness.
18	(A discussion was had off the record
19	regarding someone needing to mute
2 0	their audio after which the
21	proceedings continued as follows:)
22	(The witness was sworn.)
23	T H O M A S M C G U I R E
2 4	was called as a witness by the Defendants, and

	Page 8
1	having been first duly sworn, testified as follows:
2	EXAMINATION
3	BY MR. KEYES:
4	Q. Good morning, Professor McGuire. Would you
5	please state your full name for the record?
6	A. Good morning. My name is Thomas Gregory
7	McGuire.
8	Q. And you are serving as a testifying expert
9	in this case, correct?
10	A. Yes.
11	Q. And you're serving as a testifying expert
12	for the plaintiffs in this case?
13	A. That's right, for the plaintiffs.
14	Q. And who do you understand to be the
15	plaintiffs in this case?
16	A. I understand the plaintiffs to be the City
17	of Huntington and Cabell County.
18	Q. And you've issued a written report setting
19	forth your opinions in this case?
20	A. Yes, I have.
21	Q. And that report is dated August 3rd, 2020?
22	A. Yes, it is.
23	Q. And then you submitted an errata sheet to
2 4	that report?

A. Yes, I did.

1

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

20

- Q. And you submitted that errata sheet on August 24th, 2020?
 - A. Yeah, I believe that's correct.
 - Q. And that errata sheet sets forth corrections or modifications to your original report, correct?
 - A. Yes, it does.
 - Q. Okay. Other than your original report and that errata sheet, have you prepared anything in writing that sets forth your opinions in this case?
 - A. No, I have not.
 - Q. Okay. I believe your report is titled the professor -- the "Report of Professor Thomas

 McGuire Regarding Public Nuisance in the Cabell

 Huntington Community in West Virginia."
- Did I get that title right?
- 18 A. I'd have to check. Should I look at it or 19 not?
 - Q. It sounds right to you so far.
- 21 A. It's -- I'll go with it.
- Q. Okay. And that report sets forth your
- 23 opinions in this case?
- 24 A. Yes, it does.

- Q. And the statements in that report are your statements?
 - A. Yes, they are.
 - Q. And the calculations in that report are your calculations?
 - A. Yes, they are.

MR. PENDELL: Objection.

- Q. And the work reflected in that report is your work?
 - A. Yes, it is.
- Q. And does that report include all of the opinions that you intend to offer in this case as a testifying expert for the plaintiffs?
 - A. Unless I'm asked to do more, that's that.
- Q. Okay. So at this point in time, have you been asked to do more?
- 17 A. No, I haven't.
- 18 Q. When were you first engaged to work on this 19 case as a testifying expert?
 - A. I went back and looked at my records, and I began to record hours in January of this year.
- Now, I -- it might have been an engagement prior to
- 23 that, but probably not very much farther than that
- 24 and --

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

20

21

1 Q. Who --

5

6

8

10

11

12

13

14

16

20

24

- A. -- (Zoom audio glitch)
- 3 Q. -- first approached you about serving as a
 4 testifying expert in this case?
 - A. It likely would have been Renee Rushnawitz of Greylock McKinnon.
 - Q. And why do you believe it's likely that it was her?
 - A. She's an officer of the company and tends to field requests from counsel, and then would have passed the request on to me.
 - Q. And in your prior answer, you referenced "the company." Are you referring to Greylock McKinnon Associates?
- 15 A. Yes, that's it.
 - Q. Did you write the report?
- 17 A. Yes, I did.
- 18 Q. Did anyone else write portions of the 19 report for you?
 - A. No, I wouldn't say, no.
- Q. When you were first engaged as an expert in this case, what did you understand the scope of your assignment to be?
 - A. Well, I understood it to -- to bear on the

subject of public nuisance, and then to -- with respect to public nuisance, consider whether the net costs of prescription opioids in the -- in what I'll call "the community - by which I mean Cabell County and Huntington - are sufficiently large to support the conclusion that they were a public nuisance.

Q. Anything else?

2.3

2.4

- A. Well, my assignment is -- you know, in more detail, is on the first couple pages of my report, and has three pieces. But that's the, you know, general subject of what my assignment was.
- Q. In Paragraph 5 of your report, you say, quote, "I have been assisted in this matter by staff of Greylock McKinnon Associates working under my direction."

Did anyone besides the staff of Greylock McKinnon Associates provide any assistance?

MR. PENDELL: Hold on. Andy, I don't know if other people are, but we're having a hard time hearing you. You sort of sound like you're underwater.

MR. KO: Yeah, I have the same

- 1 | The time is 9:14 a.m.
- 2 | VIDEO OPERATOR: Now begins Media Unit
- 3 | 2 in the deposition of Tom McGuire. We're back on
- 4 | the record. The time is 9:21 a.m.
- 5 BY MR. KEYES:

6

- Q. Professor McGuire, sorry for the delay.
- A. No problem.
- Q. In Paragraph 5 of your report, you say,
- 9 | quote, "I have been assisted in this matter by
- 10 staff of Greylock McKinnon Associates working under
- 11 | my direction."
- 12 Did anyone besides the staff of
- 13 | Greylock McKinnon Associates provide any assistance
- 14 | to you in this engagement?
- 15 A. No, they didn't.
- 16 Q. I believe that staff from Compass Lexecon
- 17 | had assisted you in a prior engagement with
- 18 | different plaintiffs in the opioid litigation. Did
- 19 anyone from Compass Lexecon help you on this
- 20 engagement?
- 21 A. No, they didn't.
- 22 Q. Okay. How many staff from Greylock
- 23 | McKinnon Associates assisted on this engagement?
- A. Most of them would have been, you know, you

- would say part-time. But of the total number of people who would have assisted, I -- my guess is six, seven.
 - Q. And who are they?

4

5

6

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

- A. My primary contact at Greylock McKinnon was Adrian Garcia. And also Renee Rushnawitz was very helpful. And then Adrian would have organized work of analysts to, you know, conduct different tasks with respect to the report.
 - Q. How many different --
 - A. I'm sorry. Would you like names?
- Q. Yes. Do you have names?
 - A. Yes. Travis Donahoe was one of the analysts, and he happens to be from Huntington, West Virginia, went to Marshall.
 - Then -- that's -- I'm sorry, that's the only name I can recall at this point.
 - Q. Okay. So what was Renee Rushnawitz's role in this engagement?
 - A. I would say -- she's a kind of jack of all trades and very experienced in litigation, so -- I don't know. She would, you know, help organize who does what and help problem solve generally.
 - Q. Did she work on any particular issue or

issues covered by your report?

1

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

2.4

- A. No, I don't think so.
- Q. What about Adrian Garcia? You said that he -- he coordinated the work of different analysts to do different tasks. But did Mr. Garcia work on any particular issue or issues covered by your report?
 - A. He worked on all the issues, I would say.
 - Q. Okay. And what did Travis Donahoe do?
- A. He mostly worked on the labor force analysis and some on the -- mostly within the morbidity section, I would say. There's a couple pieces there that he helped with.
- Q. And how much time did the staff of Greylock McKinnon Associates spend on this engagement?
- A. Now, I never saw any record of that, so I really wouldn't know.
- Q. Okay. And do each of them charge an hourly rate?
 - A. Well, they -- they would be billed at an hourly rate by Greylock McKinnon, but actually, I don't know how that works, so sorry. I can't tell you.
- Q. Okay. In the Summit County and Cuyahoga County case in which you served as a testifying

expert, you testified that your report in that case on nuisance was your first public nuisance venture.

Do you recall that testimony?

A. Yes, I do.

4

5

6

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

20

21

- Q. And you testified in that Summit County and Cuyahoga County case that you had never served as a testifying expert offering opinions regarding a public nuisance before that case. Do you recall that testimony?
 - A. I do, yes.
- Q. Okay. And in your report in this case, on page 3 of your summary of litigation experience, you say that you have prepared an expert report in the case filed as State of Washington versus Purdue Pharma in King County Superior Court in Washington.

Do you recall that?

- A. Yes, I do.
- Q. And so in that case, you've submitted an expert report?
 - A. I did, yes.
 - Q. Have you been deposed in that case?
- 22 A. It would be written there.
- 23 Q. Yeah, you wrote here that you had an expert 24 report in July of 2019, and there's no reference to

- 1 | being deposed.
 - A. Yeah, I wasn't deposed then.
 - Q. Okay. And you describe the scope of your assignment in that State of Washington case as, quote, "identification and valuation of public nuisance outcomes." Do you see that?
 - A. Yes.
 - Q. Okay. So other than the work you did in the Summit County and Cuyahoga case and the State of Washington case, and of course, this case, is there any other case where you have served as a testifying expert offering opinions regarding a public nuisance case -- a public nuisance?
 - A. That --
 - MR. PENDELL: Go ahead, Tom.
 - A. I'm sorry. Do you mean by that a completed report?

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

MR. PENDELL: Yeah, I just wanted -Professor McGuire, to the extent you've been -you've been disclosed as an expert and provided a
report, you can answer that question, but you know,
if you've been retained in other cases and not yet
disclosed and -- or submitted an expert report,

1 | then I would not talk about those engagements.

Does that make sense?

THE DEPONENT: That was my -- that was what my question was about.

- A. So with that clarification, there's nothing else.
- Q. Okay. So is it accurate to say that the only cases that you have served as a testifying expert offering opinions regarding a public nuisance are the Summit County and Cuyahoga County case, the State of Washington case and this case?

 MR. PENDELL: Objection to form.
 - A. Yes.

4

5

6

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

- Q. And your report says you are paid \$850.00 per hour? Is that accurate?
 - A. Yes, that's correct.
- Q. How many hours have you worked on this case?
 - A. I checked my records on this, so I can give you a pretty good number. I began recording hours in January of 2020, and through August of 2020 which was the last accounting that I sent in to Greylock McKinnon, the total was 180 hours.

And of course, there'd be some in

- September, so there might be to this point 20 more hours or so.
 - Q. Okay. So as of August of 2020, the total was 180 hours, and you anticipate roughly another 20 hours since the end of August?
 - A. Yes, that's correct.

2.4

- Q. And to whom do you submit your invoices?
 Or your time records.
 - A. I submit them to Renee Rushnawitz.
- Q. Okay. And you say in your report that in addition to the hourly rate you receive, you also receive compensation from Greylock McKinnon

 Associates based on the collected staff billings of Greylock McKinnon Associates in support of your work in this matter.

How is that compensation calculated?

A. It's a little mysterious to me, but what I know about it is that staff billings refer to a subset of the people who have worked on this report. For example, Renee Rushnawitz's time is not included in that calculation.

But then the billings of Adrian and the analysts, I believe, would be included in that.

And then there's a percentage of that that's

figured and paid to me.

1

4

5

6

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.4

- Q. And how is that percentage calculated?
- A. That's the mysterious part to me. It varies according to my role. And I -- I just don't -- I don't focus on it. It is what it is and I'm happy when I get the money.
- Q. So what is the amount of the compensation that you've received or will receive from Greylock McKinnon Associates based on the collected staff billings of staff in support of your work in this matter?
- A. I have not received anything so far, and -I don't know. It tends to happen, you know, when
 something is resolved, finished, end of story,
 whatever -- whatever happens to a matter, and I -I'm not sure.
- Q. So you don't know what the percentage is, and you don't know what the payment will be?
 - A. That's correct.
- Q. Do you have any estimate or expectation what that amount will be?
- A. You want me to give an estimate of what it

 -- in my experience, the payment might be?
 - Q. Yes.

MR. PENDELL: Hold on. I just want to object. But you can answer.

A. I'd say \$20,000 to \$25,000.

2.4

- Q. Okay. And how are you arriving at that estimate of \$20,000 or \$25,000?
- A. I've done other cases through GMA, and it -- this is a guess. You know, based on the kind of level of effort in this case, and comparing that to other cases, that's what I would expect the outcome to be.
- Q. In past cases when you've received compensation from Greylock McKinnon Associates based on the work of staff in support of your engagement, have you received some kind of accounting that explains how that number was derived?
 - A. No, I haven't.
- Q. You haven't gotten a report that says you're gonna receive X percent of Y hours spent by the staff on the engagement?
- A. That's correct. I receive no details of the accounting. I don't know -- that's why I don't know the percentage. And I -- in none of the previous matters did I know either the total

- billings by staff, nor did I know the percentage.
- Q. I take it you don't know the percentage or the formula, but is there a -- an agreed-upon formula? Or is the amount that you receive for this type of compensation discretionary?
 - A. My understanding is that it's not discretionary, that there is a formula. It's just I haven't focused on it.
 - Q. In Appendix B of your report, you list a series of meetings and calls in which you participated with personnel from Cabell County or Huntington. Do you recall that?
 - A. Yes, I do.

1

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

- Q. What was your purpose in participating in those meetings and calls?
- A. Very generally to learn things about the local situation.
- Q. And how much time did you spend in the March 4th, 2020 in-person meeting that you list on page Appendix B-18?
- A. It would have been part of two -
 MR. PENDELL: Mr. -- Andy, is he
 allowed to look at the report?

MR. KEYES: Sure.

1 | MR. PENDELL: I just didn't know --

- Q. If it's helpful, you can pull out the report. Yeah, if it's helpful, you can pull out the report and you can look at that page. It's page Appendix B-18.
- A. Okay. I don't need it for this one, but I'll just get the report and bring it closer to me which would give me a feeling of security.
 - Q. Okay.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.3

- A. That particular in-person meeting would have been part of two days. And so in the afternoon of the first day, we had some meetings and then a dinner with some of the local people, and then the next day, there was another series of meetings that ended I'm not sure when. 2:00 or 3:00 or something like that.
- So I'm just going to move a little bit, get my report, and I'll be like two seconds.
 - Q. Okay.
 - A. Okay.
- Q. Okay. Well, why don't you turn to that list on page Appendix B-18.
 - A. Okay, I'm there.
- Q. Okay. And do you see the section Titled

- 1 | "Meetings and Calls"?
- 2 A. I do, yes.
- Q. And then the first entry is for March 4th,
- 5 A. Yes.

6

7

8

10

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.4

- Q. And it lists in-person meeting with counsel and Dr. Lyn O'Connell, Chief Jan Rader, Mayor Steve Williams, Captain Rocky Johnson, Dr. Zach Hansen, Doctor Todd Davies and Dr. Chafin. Do you see that?
- 11 A. I do, yes.
- Q. Okay. And so you're saying that this actually occurred over two days, March 4th and March 5th?
 - A. I'm not sure which -- which of the dates of the two days, but there were some afternoon meetings prior to the big meeting.
 - Q. And did the in-person meeting described here occur before or after you started writing your report?
 - A. Probably you would say after.
- Q. Okay. So when did you write the report in this case?
 - A. Oh, I think I would have started, you know,

right at the beginning, you know, outlining what it's gonna be, entering some of the material that I could enter, you know, as soon as possible, setting up the tables.

- Q. And when you say, "the beginning," are you referring to January of 2020?
 - A. I would say January of 2020, yeah.
- Q. Okay. Did -- did your in-person meeting with counsel and these individuals cause you to change direction in how you were approaching your assignment?
- A. I'm not sure what you mean by "change direction".
- Q. Did it cause you to do something differently than you had already started doing?
- A. Well, I would say it -- you know, the in-person meetings were, I think, very helpful to see -- you know, to move from the level of abstract national statistics down to a real place with real people and how these things are affecting individuals in the community.
- And it was quite -- you know, quite effective. So it -- it reinforced in my mind the importance of not just, you know, doing the

- national-based calculations, but to where I -- to the extent I could, to relate that to the local on-the-ground experience.
 - Q. And where did these in-person meetings occur?
 - A. The in-person meetings were in the law offices of somebody or other in Huntington.
 - Q. In the law offices of one of the law firms representing the plaintiffs?
 - A. Well, I don't know that to be so, but it was in law offices.
 - Q. Okay. And then on the same page of your report, you list a series of calls with counsel and various individuals between March 31st, 2020 and July 31st, 2020. Do you see that list?
 - A. I do, yes.

- Q. Okay. Did you take notes during any of these calls or meetings?
 - A. No, I did not take notes.
- Q. Did you take notes in any of your in-person meetings or any of your calls that are listed on this page?
- A. I did take some notes from the first meeting, yes.

- 1 Q. Okay.
- A. But subsequent to that, I -- it was always

 -- you know, Adrian was on these calls, and I

 relied upon him to, you know, note down anything

 that would be -- we need to --
 - Q. Okay.

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

- A. (Zoom audio glitch)
- Q. So let me make sure I understand. For the in-person meetings that occurred either on March 3rd or 4th or the 4th and 5th, you did take some notes?
 - A. Yes, that's correct.
- Q. Okay. And did you -- were these handwritten notes, or were these notes you took on a laptop or a computer?
- A. I put them on a -- in a file on a computer. I didn't put them originally on a laptop, no.
- Q. Okay. So you took handwritten notes and then you typed them up and saved them in a computer file?
- A. It may have been that, or I may have just noted down things I remembered. I can't remember whether I actually had handwritten notes.
 - Q. Okay. And did you share the notes either

- the handwritten version or the typed-up version with counsel for the plaintiffs?
 - A. No, I did not.

4

6

8

10

11

- Q. Okay. Where are those notes now?
- 5 A. In the cloud somewhere.
 - Q. Okay. Do you know how to find them?
 - A. I could probably find them, yes.
 - Q. Okay. And then turning to the calls you had with counsel and these witnesses between the end of March and the end of July, you did not take any notes; is that correct?
- 12 A. That's correct.
- Q. But I think you said Adrian from GMA did take some notes?
- 15 A. Yes. That's -- yes.
- Q. And did he take notes at your direction, or on his own initiative?
- A. I think I instructed him to take notes of anything that we needed to remember after the calls.
- 21 Q. Anyone besides Adrian take notes of any of these calls?
- MR. PENDELL: Objection.
- A. Well, he's the only one I know of.

- Q. Okay. Did Adrian participate in all of these calls with you and these individuals? Or just some of them?
 - A. You know, I can't remember any he missed.

 I think he was in all of them or virtually all of them.
 - Q. And when he took notes, did he take them by hand, or did he type them up on a laptop or a computer?
- A. I don't know.

1

2

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

18

19

20

21

- Q. After he took the notes, was there ever an occasion where you looked at them as part of your work in preparing your report?
 - A. No, I did not.
- Q. Have you ever seen his notes of these conversations?
- 17 A. No, I have not.

redactions?

- MR. KEYES: Mike, we received three pages of typewritten notes that had redactions.

 Are you able to tell me the basis for the
- MR. PENDELL: I am -- I am not.
- MR. KEYES: Okay. Would you make a note to look into that and let us know whether the

redactions are based on a claim of privilege or for some other reason?

MR. PENDELL: Will do.

MR. KEYES: Okay.

2.4

- Q. And did your calls with any of these listed individuals cause you to change your approach?
- A. Oh, I -- again, I don't think it's a matter of change of approach. You know, I'm trying to -- just to do, you know, a standard economic analysis here. And these individuals were not there to, you know, counsel me on the economic analysis.

It had to do with, you know, the nature of the impacts in the community and, in some cases, data sources.

- Q. Focusing on the in-person meeting with counsel and the listed individuals, to what extent, if any, are you relying on what you were told in those meetings in offering your opinions in this case?
- A. I have a hard time answering that other than, you know, elaborating on what I said a few minutes ago, that these individuals were various public servants and medical people in the Huntington area that could give concrete reports

about the kind of things that I was concerned with in my public nuisance report, and it confirmed the importance and --

2.3

I don't know. That's -- that's more or less how I, you know, would see these meetings.

- Q. Did -- did any of these individuals provide any factual information that you relied on in terms of structuring your analysis or performing your calculations?
- A. I would say to that question, in terms of structuring my analysis, I would say no. That I could -- I could bring that to the table.
- Q. Okay. And returning to these calls you had from the -- between the end of March and the end of July, did you rely on any information from any of these individuals in preparing your report?
- A. Well, I think you will see some in my report. The -- in some cases, there's, you know, quotes from these people. In some cases, there's material provided by -- I don't know if he's here.
- -- the fellow who provided the heat maps.
- These things all fed into -- fed into my report. But I think it's there in my report if

1 | I relied upon it.

calculations?

4

- Q. Did you rely on anything they said in structuring your analysis or performing your
- A. I mean, with respect to that, I would say

 no. I could structure the analysis based on my

 expertise, and the calculations I could also figure

 out how to do.
 - Q. Would you turn to page Appendix B-3?
- 10 A. Okay.
- 11 Q. Are you there?
- 12 A. Yes.
- Q. You list a number of deposition transcripts. Do you see that list?
- 15 | A. Yes, I do.
- 16 Q. Did you read each of those deposition transcripts?
- 18 A. I read a lot of deposition transcripts.
- 19 Q. Okay. Well, is this -- I didn't mean to 20 cut you off.
- 21 A. No, you go ahead.
- 22 Q. Is this a complete list of deposition 23 transcripts that you read in whole or in part?
- 24 A. Yes, I believe it is.

- Q. Okay. So for the ones that are listed here, did you read each one of them in its entirety?
- A. Well, that would probably be going too far. I didn't read each of them in their entirety. What I was interested in is if any part of the deposition had to do with something relating to my report. And then I would slow down and read that more carefully.

And you know, sometimes I would then draw material from them.

- Q. Did anyone prepare summaries of these deposition transcripts for you to read?
 - A. No, they didn't.

2.4

- Q. And so how did you know what portions of the deposition transcripts you should read because they related to your work in this matter?
- A. Well, mostly it's looking at the deposition, you know, seeing a subject that's being discussed, and it takes pages and pages for some of the subjects to be handled, and so then you flip, flip, flip until you see something -- you know, some key words maybe that look like something you would be interested in, and then you stop and read

1 that.

- You also list a number of expert reports. I believe you list seven expert reports here. you see that?
- Α. Yes.
- Are those all of the expert reports that Ο. you had read prior to submitting your report on August 3rd?
 - Α. Yes, that's correct.
- Ο. And did you read each of those reports in its entirety?
 - Well, I did read Keyes in its entirety. I think the others were in the same category of the depositions. There's some stuff I didn't focus on and some other stuff I did.
 - Ο. And did you read the final version that was submitted on August 3rd, the same day as your report, or did you read an earlier version of those reports?
- The Keyes report, I read the final version, Α. and I believe the other ones as well too.
- Are these all of the expert reports that have been submitted by the plaintiffs in this case?
 - Α. Hmm. I don't know one way or the other.

888-391-3376 www.veritext.com

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15 16

17

18 19

20 21

22

2.3

2.4

- Q. So how did you come to review these reports in particular? Did you ask for them? Or did someone else suggest you read them?
- A. I know I asked for, you know, at least three of these. I -- Lembke, Keyes and Waller. I don't remember Thompson and Smith.
- Q. Just to make sure I understand, you -- you recall asking to see the expert reports written by Lembke, Keyes and Waller?
- A. That's what I recall. And I don't recall whether or not I did with respect to Smith or Thompson.
 - Q. Okay. How about McCann?
- A. Same. I mean, same in the sense that I don't recall having asked one way or the other.
- Q. Okay. Did you speak with Craig McCann before he submitted his report?
- A. No, I didn't.

1

2

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

- Q. Have you spoken with Craig McCann since he submitted his report?
 - A. No, I haven't.
- Q. So have you ever spoken with Craig McCann?
- A. I don't think so. I may have in another matter, but I can't recall.

- Q. Did you speak with Doctor Waller before he submitted his report?
- MR. PENDELL: Objection.
- 4 A. No, I didn't.

5

6

8

- Q. Have you spoken with Doctor Waller since he submitted his report?
- A. No, I haven't.
 - Q. Have you ever spoken with Doctor Waller?
- A. No, I don't think so.
- 10 Q. Did you speak with Doctor Thompson before she submitted her report?
- 12 A. Not that I recall, no.
- Q. Did you speak with Doctor Thompson since she submitted her report?
- 15 A. No, I haven't.
- 16 Q. Have you ever spoken with Doctor Thompson?
- 17 A. No, I don't think so.
- 18 Q. Did you speak with Professor Keyes before she submitted her report?
- 20 A. Yes, I did.
- 21 Q. How many times?
- 22 A. Well, I first met Professor Keyes in the
- 23 March visit in 2020, and of course, we spoke there.
- 24 | We were there, you know, for that time. And then

- 1 | Professor Keyes was on maybe all or certainly
- 2 most of the calls that are listed on page B-18 of
- 3 this.

14

- 4 Q. Okay. Separate from the March 2020 visit
- 5 and the calls that are listed on Appendix B-18, did
- 6 you speak with doc -- Professor Keyes before she
- 7 | submitted her report?
- 8 A. You know, I don't think so.
- 9 Q. And have you spoken with Professor Keyes
 10 since she submitted her report?
- 11 A. No, I have not.
- 12 Q. Did you speak with Doctor Lembke before she submitted her report?
 - A. No, I did not.
- 15 Q. Did you speak with Doctor Lembke since she submitted her report?
- 17 A. No, I have not.
- 18 Q. Have you ever spoken with Doctor Lembke?
- 19 A. No, I don't think so.
- 20 Q. And did you speak with Doctor Smith before
- 21 | he submitted his report?
- 22 A. Yes, I did.
- Q. How many times?
- 24 A. Once, I believe.

- 1 Q. When was that?
- A. That would have been on one of the calls.
- 3 | I -- probably listed on B-18.
- Do you want me to take a look?
- 5 | O. Sure.
- 6 A. All right. I may be mixing him up with
- 7 | someone. So I --
- 8 Q. Looking at --
 - A. I'm sorry.
- 10 Q. -- page B-18 --
- 11 A. Yeah, I (Zoom audio glitch) --
- 12 Q. -- refresh your recollection as to whether
- 13 you spoke with Doctor Smith at any time before he
- 14 | submitted his report?
- A. Yeah, maybe I didn't. I'm sorry if I got
- 16 | that wrong.
- 17 Q. Have you spoken with Doctor Smith since he
- 18 | submitted his report?
- 19 A. No, I haven't.
- Q. Okay. And after looking at Appendix B-18,
- 21 | do you believe you've ever spoken with Doctor
- 22 | Smith?
- A. No, I don't think I have.
- Q. Okay. I've gone through the experts whose

reports you list here on Appendix B-3. Did you speak with any other expert who submitted a report for the plaintiffs at any time?

A. No.

1

2

4

5

6

8

10

11

12

13

16

17

18

19

20

Oh, Caleb Alexander, I -- was on some of the calls. Now, if you consider that "speaking with," but he was on some of the calls.

- Q. Anyone else besides Caleb Alexander?
- A. No.
- Q. Okay. And you believe that Cal -- Caleb Alexander was on some of the calls that are listed on B-18?
 - A. Yes. He or --
- Q. Separate from those calls, did you speak with Caleb Alexander?
 - A. No, I did not.
 - Q. So at this point, do you believe you've identified for me every conversation you had with any testifying expert for the plaintiffs in this case?
- MR. PENDELL: Objection.
- You can answer. Go ahead.
- A. Well, to the best of my recollection, yes, that I've told you everything I know.

Q. When you spoke with Doctor Keyes, did you discuss her methodology for the opinions and calculations she offered in her report?

- A. Well, yes, in the sense that I needed to know what she was doing so that I could be ready for it when the time came.
- Q. Right. You couldn't wait for her to finish her report and then start your work. Correct?
 - A. That would have been extremely difficult.
- Q. Okay. So when did you first discuss with her her methodology?
 - A. Oh, probably when we first met in March.
- Q. And what did she explain in that March meeting about her methodology?
- A. Well, Professor Keyes is an epidemiologist, as I'm sure you know. And we would have discussed, you know, the nature of the information she would be able to provide to me for purposes of my report.

And you know, maybe how she would have been going about it. I don't remember any details about that.

Q. Okay. Did she tell you that she would be attempting to identify specific data points that you intended to use in your quantification?

1 MR. PENDELL: Object to the form.

A. At some point, you know, that was covered. I don't -- I don't -- we probably weren't so specific in March. Just to get a general sense of what her role is, what my role is, how might it work.

Probably the details were ironed out mostly by staff, I would say, in the subsequent months.

- Q. Did you have subsequent conversations with Doctor Keyes?
- A. Now, you asked about this, and I don't -- I don't recall that we spoke in person about this, aside from the meetings we were in together.
- Q. So if I understand correctly, you said that you did speak with her at the in-person meeting in March of 2020, and that Doctor Keyes was on all of the calls with you that you listed on Appendix B-18, but you have not spoken with her since her report was issued.

Did I get that right?

A. I have not spoken with her since her report was issued, that's -- I'm 100 percent sure of that.

I'm not sure if there was some other

Veritext Legal Solutions
www.veritext.com

888-391-3376

- Keyes/McGuire conversation outside of the ones that
 you listed there. There may have been. I just -I don't remember.
 - Q. Who are the defendants in this case?
 - A. Well, my understanding are there -- the -- what I would call the distributors.
 - Q. Who are they?

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

2.4

- A. I'm not gonna get them all. But Cardinal, AmerisourceBergen, McKesson, and then some of the -- you know, what an economist would refer to as integrated firms like Wal-Mart, Rite Aid, CVS, that ,you know, had multiple roles in the drug distribution chain. But I'm sure --
- Q. Anyone else -- I'm sorry to interrupt. Go ahead.
 - A. No, I'm sure there are others. I just can't recall any more at this point.
 - Q. Okay. So have you listed for me all of the entities that you believe are defendants in this case?
- A. Well, I believe those are defendants.

 There -- I also believe there are more of them that
 I don't remember right now.
 - Q. Okay. So you've listed for me the

companies that you believe are defendants in this case with the proviso that you believe there are other defendants in this case that you can't name off the top of your head. Is that fair?

- A. That's very fair. Thank you.
- Q. Okay. On page 6 of your report, you say, quote, "My Report addresses the economic harms imposed by the sales and distribution of prescription opioids from 2006 through 2018."

Do you see that?

A. Yes, I do.

1

2

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

2.4

- Q. Okay. It's the second sentence of Paragraph 11 on page 6.
 - A. I have it right here.
- Q. Okay. What do you mean by "sales and distribution of prescription opioids"?
- A. Well, I think these have just common meanings, that the distribution of prescription opioids is the, you know, movement from the manufacturer through the -- to the retail.

And the sales are the -- the thing that takes place when someone buys something.

Q. So as you use the terms in your report, do sales and distribution mean different things?

- A. You mean is sales different than distribution?
 - Q. Yes. As you use the term in your report.
 - A. Well, they're -- they, I think, refer to somewhat different things as part of the process by which prescription opioids move from the manufacturer to the consumer.
 - Q. Okay. I'm just trying to understand whether when you use the phrase "sales and distribution," that's referring to one thing or it's referring to two things.
 - A. Oh.

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

2.4

Q. And I believe what you've said is it means two different things. One is distribution means the shipment of the goods from manufacturer to retail; and the sales is when someone at the retail level is -- is buying or selling something.

Is that a fair encapsulation of how you mean the terms?

MR. PENDELL: Objection.

A. Well, I -- it's -- in response to your question, I was answering -- attempting to give a kind of definition of what distribution is and what sales are. It's one, you know, kind of process in

a way in which the drugs move from the manufacturer to the retail.

I'm not sure what you're getting at in your question.

- Q. Okay. When you refer to "sales and distribution of prescription opioids," you're referring to distribution as going from manufacturer to retail. Is that accurate?

 MR. PENDELL: Object to the form.
- A. You know, I haven't thought of this as a kind of a narrow issue. I'm pausing to think about your question.

So I would say, you know, sales and distribution - you know, unless I'm missing something subtle here that I just don't see - yes, refers to the movement of opioids from, you know, the manufacturer ultimately to -- ultimately to retail, and from there, being sold to consumers.

- Q. And in this report, you are quantifying the harms imposed by all sales and distribution of prescription opioids from 2006 through 2018.

 Correct?
- A. Well, yes. These are net harms. But yes.

 Other than that, I agree with your statement.

- Q. And so in quantifying the harms resulting from the sale or distribution of prescription opioids, you didn't exclude any prescription opioid sales or distributions during that time period, 2006 to 2018. Correct?
 - A. Didn't exclude.

2.4

MR. PENDELL: I'm just going to object to the form of that question.

But you can answer, Professor.

- A. Well, I considered, in total, the net harms or net costs associated with the sale and distribution of prescription opioids. I didn't think of myself as excluding anything.
- Q. Right. But I'm trying to say, was there some category of prescription opioids that were sold and distributed that you excluded from your quantification of the harms?
- A. No, I don't think so. I think I included everything.
- Q. Did you separate out the harms that were imposed by the sales and distribution of prescription opioids from 2006 through 2018 by actors other than the defendants in this case?
 - A. I'll get to that, but I want to be clear.

You -- I don't object to the word "harms," but costs would be a more accurate phrase in what I came up with.

MR. PENDELL: I'll -- I'll object to the word.

Go ahead.

- A. In response to your question, my assignment was not to allocate responsibility for the costs across, you know, different parties in the case.
- Q. Okay. So did you separate out the economic harms that were imposed by the sales and distribution of prescription opioids from 2006 through 2018 by actors other than the defendants in this case?

MR. PENDELL: Objection to form.

- A. My -- my role was to estimate the total, and I understand that not to have involved separating out the contribution of different actors.
- Q. During the time period covered by your report 2006 through 2018 who did you understand to be the whole -- wholesale distributors of prescription opioids in Cabell County, West Virginia?

- A. My understanding goes -- would be based on the defendants in this case, and that would be the basis of my understanding of who was doing the distributing.
- Q. Can you list them then? Who you believe were wholesale distributors of prescription opioids in Cabell County, West Virginia between 2006 and 2018?

MR. PENDELL: Objection.

A. Yeah, I don't know the market shares - if I could use that term - in Cabell County of the role of different distributors. So I can't answer it from that perspective.

The perspective I can answer it from is who are listed defendants in the case.

Q. Okay. Were there sellers of prescription opioids in Cabell County, West Virginia between 2006 and 2018 who did not get the prescription opioids they sold from wholesale distributors?

MR. PENDELL: Object to the form.

A. I'm not sure.

2.4

Q. Okay. Are you able to identify whether there were any sellers of prescription opioids in Cabell County, West Virginia who did not get

prescription opioids they sold from wholesale distributors?

MR. PENDELL: Objection.

- A. No, I'm not able to identify any seller of that category.
- Q. Okay. Is it accurate to say that you quantified the economic harms imposed by the sale and distribution of all prescription opioids from 2006 through 2018 and not just the economic harms of selling and distributing prescription opioids above a certain threshold amount?

MR. PENDELL: Objection to form.

- A. Yes. My understanding of my assignment would be to -- to, you know, account the net costs of all prescription opioids, you know, without attempting to segment them into various categories.
- Q. So did you -- did you segment the economic harms imposed by the sale and distribution of prescription -- prescription opioids between an appropriate amount of sales and distribution versus an inappropriate amount of sale and distribution?

 MR. PENDELL: Objection to form.

A. My task was to consider the total, and issues with respect to clinical appropriateness

Veritext Legal Solutions
www.veritext.com

888-391-3376

2.3

were not within my purview in this report.

Those inputs came from elsewhere.

- Q. Okay. So again, you quantified what you call the net economic harm imposed by the sale and distribution of all prescription opioids in Cabell County, West Virginia from 2006 through 2018, right?
- A. That's very close. I would say, "net cost," though. But yes, it's the net cost over that time period of the sale and distribution of all prescription opioids.
- Q. So you think it should say, "net costs" rather than "net economic harms"?
 - A. I like "net costs" better, yes.
- Q. Okay. And then you didn't do anything to further separate out or segment or tease out the economic harms based on an appropriate level of sales and distribution versus an inappropriate level of sales and distribution.

MR. PENDELL: Objection to form.

- Q. Right?
- A. Well, that's, I think, the same question I got a minute ago, and my answer is the same: That my job was to look at the total net -- the net

costs of -- of the sale and distribution of all prescription opioids over that time period.

2.3

2.4

And issues with respect to clinical appropriateness were not part of my assignment.

Q. Okay. Did you separate out or segment out or tease out the net economic harms or costs imposed by an excessive amount of sales and distributions of all prescription opioids versus a reasonable level of sale and distribution of prescription opioids?

MR. PENDELL: Objection.

- A. Well, "reasonable" and "excessive" in this context, I think, are clinical terms. At least I understand them to be clinical terms. Issues which were addressed by other plaintiff experts. I used those opinion -- opinions as inputs, but my job was to look at the total and look at the net.
- Q. Okay. Without regarding to a dividing line between appropriate and inappropriate.
- A. Well, that would have been factored in by the clinical experts.
- Q. Okay. Without regard to the dividing line between reasonable and unreasonable.
 - A. Again, that would have been factored in by

the clinical experts.

2.3

2.4

- Q. Without regard to the dividing line between a reasonable amount of sale and distribution of opioids versus an excessive amount of sale and distribution of prescription opioids.
- A. I also hear that as a question about clinical matters, which the clinical experts would have taken into account and used -- and I would use those inputs in my report.
- Q. And do you articulate the dividing line between a tolerable level of sales and distribution of prescription opioids versus an intolerable level?

MR. PENDELL: I'll object.

A. Well, I don't know what "intolerable" means, but I don't think I need to know the answer to that in your question.

That if it's a clinical matter, then, again, it was the clinical side of the expertise in this case that would have made those determinations.

Q. And do you articulate the dividing line between the amount of sale and distribution of prescription opioids that constitutes a nuisance

versus the level of sale and distribution of prescription opioids that does not constitute a nuisance?

A. You know, I wasn't asked that question. I was asked with respect --

Sorry, there's an insect trying to get on the video.

No, I was asked the question of: In total, did sale and distribution of prescription opioids constitute a public nuisance? Not whether there might have been, you know, some other situation in which they could be divided into those that were and those that were not.

Q. And when you quantify the net economic harms or the net economic costs imposed by the sales and distribution of prescription opioids from 2006 through 2018 in Cabell County, West Virginia, you're quantifying all of those, not the ones that are attributable to conduct of particular actors.

Is that correct?

A. Yes, I think that's correct. My job was to pick up the story at the point of assessing the net costs of the sale and distribution. Why that took place was not part of my assignment.

Q. So did you take any steps to eliminate from your calculations the economic harms or the costs of prescription opioids that were sold and distributed by the defendants in this case without breaching any duty?

2.3

2.4

MR. PENDELL: Objection.

- A. I think the answer to that is I did not try to segment the sale and distribution of prescription opioids nor the economic costs associated with them according to a categorization of the nature of the sale and distribution.
- Q. And are you offering any opinion of what portion of the net economic harms or costs you quantified are due to the sale and distribution of prescription opioids by the defendants in this case?
- A. I've got the total in my report, and I -- and so I would say -- I also did not as part of my assignment apportion that to particular defendants. Or non-defendants. I just -- I didn't do it.
- Q. And did you do any apportionment of the net economic harms or costs that were imposed by the sales and distribution of prescription opioids from

2006 through 2018 in Cabell County, West Virginia, to the unlawful sale or the unlawful distribution of prescription opioids by the defendants?

2.4

MR. PENDELL: Objection.

A. Well, I wouldn't be in a good position to say what is lawful and unlawful, but I think I can answer the question anyway.

My assignment dealt with the total, and I didn't attempt to apportion it into a category of lawful and unlawful, even if I were able to know what that meant in this case.

Q. Did you make any assessment of which sales and distribution of prescription opioids by defendants were the result of filling and shipping a suspicious order?

MR. PENDELL: Objection.

- A. My -- again, my emphasis was on the total, and this would be a different way to think about a partition of the shipments and sales, and I didn't partition it in this way either.
- Q. Did you make any assessment of which of the prescription opioids that were sold or distributed by defendants in this case were justified by a clinical need?

MR. PENDELL: Objection.

2.3

2.4

- A. Well, certainly not at the individual level did I attempt to determine whether individual prescriptions were a result of medical need. But again, this is in the clinical realm and was something that was considered by the clinical experts in this case, and they provided helpful input into my report regarding that.
- Q. Well, you didn't do it at the individual level; you also didn't do it at the macro level, correct?
- A. Well, I wanted to, you know, be clear what I didn't do. And, yes, I didn't do it at the individual level. And also, yes, I relied on clinical inputs for the macro level.
- Q. Did you make any assessment of which of the prescription opioids that were sold and distributed by defendants were used for scientifically-acceptable treatment?

MR. PENDELL: Objection.

A. This is a clinical question as I hear it, and my assignment had to do with the total, and issues that have to do with the clinical component of which would be acceptable, which would be

unacceptable, were dealt with by clinical experts in this case.

1

4

5

6

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

2.4

- Q. Did you make any assessment of which of the prescription opioids that were sold and distributed by defendants in this case were taken by people pursuant to prescriptions written to them by their treating physician?
- A. That's another partition of the total that I did not undertake.
- Q. Did you make any assessment of which of the prescription opioids that were sold and distributed by defendants in this case were dispensed by pharmacies to patients pursuant to legitimate prescriptions written by licensed physicians?

MR. PENDELL: I'll object.

Go ahead.

- A. Well, this is a new -- a different form of partition, which I did not undertake. My assignment had to do with a total.
- Q. Did you make any assessment of which of the prescriptions that were sold and distributed by defendants were diverted long after they left the closed distribution system?

MR. PENDELL: Objection.

- A. No, I didn't make a quantification of diversion in this case.
- Q. Is the work you did based on the premise that all sales and all distribution of prescription opioids by the defendants in this case was unlawful?
 - A. No.

2.4

Q. Then did you differentiate at all between the economic harms or costs that were imposed by the unlawful sale and distribution of prescription opioids versus the lawful sale and distribution of prescription opioids?

MR. PENDELL: Objection.

A. I think this partition has been talked -- been asked about previously.

Again, I did not partition on this basis. I don't -- I wouldn't know how to do it.

It's not within my expertise. And my assignment was to compute the net economic costs of the total.

Q. Does --

MR. KEYES: Strike that.

Q. Is reduction in pain a benefit of using prescription opioids in accordance with like scientifically acceptable clinical criteria?

A. Yes, it might be.

1

3

4

5

6

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

Q. Are opioids medically indicated for severe pain associated with trauma?

MR. PENDELL: Objection.

- A. This is, of course, outside the expertise of an economist, but I've seen reports that would support that. And I believe some of the medical experts in this case also would agree with that.
- Q. Are opioids medically indicated for severe post-surgical pain?

MR. PENDELL: Objection.

- A. This is outside the scope of my expertise, but I think that they may be.
- Q. Are opioids medically indicated for severe pain associated with cancer end-of-life care?

MR. PENDELL: Objection. Outside the scope.

- A. This is outside the scope of my expertise.

 But they may be.
 - Q. Could you turn to Paragraph 56 of your report?

MR. PENDELL: Andy, at some point -you can finish this up. But I want to take a break
if we can. We've been going for a while.

	Page 61
1	MR. KEYES: Sure. Just give me a few
2	more questions.
3	MR. PENDELL: No problem. No problem.
4	Q. Professor, are you at Paragraph 56 of your
5	report?
6	A. Yes.
7	Q. Okay.
8	A. What paragraph sorry, wait. I was on
9	page hold on.
10	Q. Yeah, paragraph 56.
11	MR. PENDELL: Page 32, Professor.
12	A. Yeah, I'm there.
13	Q. Okay. Do you see the sentence on the
14	fourth line that says, quote, "Opioids are
15	medically indicated for severe pain associated with
16	trauma, post-surgery and cancer end-of-life care"?
17	A. Yes, I see that sentence.
18	Q. And you included that in your report.
19	A. There it is.
20	Q. Okay. Do you agree that opioid drugs are
21	more effective than other pain relievers for acute
22	traumatic pain?

MR. PENDELL: Objection.

No, that's way outside my area of

Veritext Legal Solutions www.veritext.com

23

24

Α.

- 1 expertise. I'm sorry, I can't give you an opinion 2 about that.
 - Q. Okay. Do you agree that opioid drugs can be critical for short-term severe pain relief in acute situations?

MR. PENDELL: Objection.

- A. Oh, I don't know. They might. It's also outside my area.
- Q. Do you agree that in short term acute pain situations such as during surgery or immediately post surgery, prescription opioids can be an important mechanism of pain relief?

MR. PENDELL: Objection.

A. Outside the scope. Maybe.

MR. KEYES: Why don't we take a break.

MR. PENDELL: Thanks.

MR. KEYES: Ten minutes? Go off the

18 record?

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

MR. PENDELL: Sure.

20 VIDEO OPERATOR: Going off the record.

21 | The time is 10:28 a.m.

22 (A recess was taken after which the

23 proceedings continued as follows:)

24 VIDEO OPERATOR: We're back on the

record. The time is 10:38 a.m. This begins Media
Unit 3 in the deposition of Tom McGuire.

BY MR. KEYES:

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

19

20

21

- Q. Professor McGuire, is improvement in function a benefit of using prescription opioids in accordance with scientifically acceptable clinical criteria?
- MR. PENDELL: Objection. Outside the scope.
 - A. That's really outside the scope of my expertise. It may be.
 - Q. Do opioids help increase the mobility of the patient?
- MR. PENDELL: Same objection.
- MR. KO: Also object to the form.
- A. They -- this is outside my area of
 expertise. It's kind of a clinical outcome sort of
 question. I'm not in a position to answer.
 - Q. Can opioids increase a person's ability to participate in life activities other than working a job?
- MR. PENDELL: Objection.
- A. This is something else that's outside my
 expertise. I really wouldn't be in a good position

1 to say.

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

Q. Can opioids be properly used to decrease a patient's anxiety about a surgical procedure?

MR. PENDELL: Objection to form.

- A. That's outside my area. I really have no idea.
- Q. Can opioids be used to decrease a patient's anxiety about an injury?

MR. PENDELL: Objection.

- A. That's outside my area. I have no idea.
- Q. Can opioids help allow a patient to have a future perspective that significant pain does not allow?

MR. PENDELL: Objection.

- A. Out -- I -- that's not my area. I really -- I have no idea.
- Q. Do you agree that the benefits of opioids have been proven useful in palliative care settings?

MR. PENDELL: Objection to form.

- A. "Proven" sounds like a statement about randomized controlled trials in these settings, and I -- I'm really not directly familiar with that.
 - Q. Can prescription opioids be appropriately

1 | used in the palliative care setting?

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

2.4

- 2 MR. PENDELL: Objection. Outside the 3 scope.
 - A. That's outside my area. I really -- I wouldn't be in a position to say.
 - Q. Can prescription opioids be appropriately used to address pain experienced by patients with terminal cancer?

MR. PENDELL: Objection to form.

- A. Could -- I'm sorry, I wasn't sure I got the wording of that. Would you please provide --
- Q. Sure. Sure. Can prescription opioids be appropriately used to address pain experienced by patients with terminal cancer?

MR. PENDELL: Objection.

- A. This is outside my area, but they may be.
- Q. Can prescription opioids be appropriately used in hospice?

MR. PENDELL: Objection to form.

- A. Well, of course, they can -- actually, this is outside my area. I'm just gonna say I really -- I'm not in a position to say.
- Q. Did you conduct any research into the benefit of using prescription opioids for hospice

1 patients?

4

5

6

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- I would say, no, I did not conduct any such research.
- Did you attempt to measure the benefit of using prescription opioids with hospice patients?
- Well, this is something that I relied on input from clinical experts for. I didn't make an independent determination.
- Okay. But did you attempt to measure the benefit of using prescription opioids with hospice patients?

MR. KO: Asked and answered.

- Α. Well, as I said in the first time this was asked, this was something that I relied on clinical input for, and I didn't make an independent determination.
- Did you conduct any research into using 0. prescription opioids to address pain experienced by patients with terminal cancer?
- I didn't conduct any of my own research on Α. that subject.
- Did you attempt to measure the benefit of using prescription opioids to address pain experienced by patients with terminal cancer?

Veritext Legal Solutions 888-391-3376 www.veritext.com

A. This is -- my answer is similar to the previous set of questions, which is that I relied on clinical input for these matters, and I didn't -- I didn't undertake any independent determination.

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

2.4

- Q. Did you attempt to measure the benefit of using opioids in palliative care settings?
- A. I also would -- in this context, would have relied on input from clinical experts, and I didn't make any independent determination.
- Q. Did you attempt to measure the benefit of using prescription opioids to provide relief from acute pain suffered by mothers who had Caesarean sections?

MR. KO: Object to the form.

- A. Could -- would you remind repeating that?

 I want to make sure I understand the form of what
 you just asked.
- Q. Sure. Did you attempt to measure the benefit from using prescription opioids to provide relief from acute pain being suffered by mothers who had undergone a Caesarean section?
- A. This is a clinical area that I relied on inputs from clinicians for my purposes. I didn't

1 attempt an independent determination.

2.4

- Q. Did you attempt to measure the benefit of using prescription opioids to provide relief from acute pain for people who had a root canal?
- A. This is the same. Clinical input was what I -- on this subject, is what I took into account. I didn't investigate root canals on my own.
- Q. Did you attempt to measure the benefit of using prescription opioids to provide relief from acute pain being suffered by people who had their wisdom teeth extracted?
- A. This is, again, an area in which I relied on clinical input. I didn't attempt any independent determination.
- Q. Did you attempt to measure the benefit of using prescription opioids to provide relief from acute pain being suffered by people who had orthopedic surgery?
- A. This is something I relied on clinical input for. I didn't attempt an independent determination.
- Q. Did you attempt to quantify the benefit from using prescription opioids to provide relief from acute pain suffered by patients who had just

1 | had surgery?

4

5

6

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

MR. PENDELL: Object to the form.

- A. Again, this is a subject I would have relied on clinical input for. I didn't make an independent determination.
- Q. Did you attempt to measure the benefit of using prescription opioids to decrease patient anxiety about their injury or a surgical procedure?

 MR. PENDELL: Objection to form.
- A. This is something I relied on clinical input for. I didn't attempt an independent determination.
- Q. Did you attempt to measure the benefit of using prescription opioids to increase a patient's mobility?
- A. I relied on clinical input for matters like this. I didn't attempt an independent determination.
- Q. Did you attempt to measure the benefit of using prescription opioids to assess a patient's function to improve?
- MR. PENDELL: Object to the form.

 Asked and answered.
- A. You know, I don't -- I'm sorry, I don't

1 | understand that question.

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

- Q. Yeah, so have you -- did you attempt to measure the benefit of using prescription opioids to help a patient's functional movement improve?

 MR. PENDELL: Objection.
- A. Sorry. I would have relied on clinical input here. I didn't attempt an independent determination.
- Q. And you've said many times now that you would have relied on the judgment of clinical experts. Did I get that right?

MR. PENDELL: Objection.

- A. Yeah, with respect to the last series of questions, yes.
- Q. Okay. What do you mean you "would have" relied on the judgment of clinical experts?
- A. Maybe that conditional "would" could be replaced by "I did rely."
- Q. Okay. What do you mean, you did rely on the judgment of the clinical experts?
- A. Well, there is a particular section of my report that addresses the issue of net costs of prescription opioids from a clinical point of view, and my understanding is the clinical expert -

primarily Doctor Lembke - would have considered the questions you asked me.

1

2

4

5

6

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

2.4

They would be much better directed to her, and she provided a global answer to the question of whether the net costs -- whether there were net costs in relation to whatever potential benefits there were, and the answer was unequivocal, and the answer was the costs vastly exceeded the benefits.

- Q. So you're relying on Doctor Lembke's opinion that the costs vastly outweigh the benefits?
 - A. I am relying on that opinion, yes.
- Q. And does Doctor Lembke offer that opinion on a macro level or on a patient-by-patient level?

 MR. PENDELL: To form.
- A. Well, the -- you know, the macro is the sum of the patients, so I think she's -- my understanding of what she's done is addressing that for the -- at a macro level, at which is the -- you know, it's the right way in this context to think about the impact of prescription opioids.
- Q. Can you point me to where in your report you rely on Doctor Lembke's judgment that the costs

- of prescription opioids vastly outweigh the benefits of prescription opioids?
 - A. Well, I think beginning on Paragraph 63 of my report, and particularly on Paragraph 64 where it says, "far outweigh the benefits." That's my under -- that's pretty much the same thing.
 - Q. And -- you just referenced Paragraph 64?
 - A. Of my report, yes.

- Q. Okay. And the excerpt from Doctor Lembke that you're referring to expresses her view "that at a population level, the risks of long-term opioids for chronic pain far outweigh the benefits"?
 - A. Yes, that's what I'm talking about.
- Q. Okay. And here, her view is at a population level, correct?
 - A. Yes. That's at a population level.
- Q. And she's talking about the risks of long-term opioids for chronic pain outweighing the benefits. Correct?
 - A. That's correct.
- Q. Where does Doctor Lembke offer the opinion that the costs of prescription opioids vastly outweigh the benefits of prescription opioids when

used to treat acute pain rather than chronic pain?

- A. Well, I'd have to look back through the quotes here.
 - Q. Okay. Are you doing that now?
 - A. I can do that now.

1

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

Well, in -- all right. You may not find the word "vastly" in my report, but there's several Lembke statements here that I believe support that, beginning in Paragraph 63.

The Lembke quote, "The best available evidence...found that non-opioid medications"

"provide equivalent or greater pain relief, while opioids confer significantly greater risks."

Now, the way I would interpret that statement is that there are less costly ways to get the same benefits, but the cost of risks significantly -- maybe that's not vastly, but significantly exceed the benefits.

And then -- well, I could -- I'm not sure what else you want me to do here, but she goes on to say that in a clinical trial, that there's very little difference between opioids and even a placebo.

Then we talked about Paragraph 64,

which is that there's -- at the population level,

for a very -- at least a very large segment of

what's going on here, the risks far outweigh the

benefits.

2.3

And let me just remind myself what else is going on here with Lembke for one sec.

Okay. I think this paragraph in contrast that I quote in my -- my Paragraph 65 is pretty definitive with respect to the very significant risks associated with prescription opioids in relation to alternatives which are equally effective.

- Q. Does Doctor Lembke offer the opinion that opioids are not indicated for acute pain?
- A. I -- gosh. Well, I'm -- I'm again looking at this paragraph to refresh myself what I said about Lembke, and there is a sentence in there that said, "Although opioids are indicated for acute pain" -- so she would --

My assumption based on that statement is that she did not say they were not indicated in all circumstances.

Q. Okay. Does -- based on your review and your understanding of what Doctor Lembke has said,

does Doctor Lembke say that the costs of prescription opioids outweighs the benefits of prescription opioids when prescription opioids are used to treat acute pain?

2.4

MR. PENDELL: Objection.

- A. Well, I did come to that conclusion from this. Equivalent relief from other less risky alternatives, that would say to me the net benefits are outweighed by the cost.
- Q. Are you relying on anything else in these excerpts from Doctor Lembke for your conclusion?
- A. I'm relying on Lembke for this. And I also mentioned Waller.

And it's very consistent. You know, there's a -- according to my reading of Waller, there's, you know, a small set of indications, you know, in relation to a very large medical risk.

- Q. Are you relying on anyone besides what Doctor Lembke said in her report and what Doctor Waller said in his report?
 - A. I'm relying on these two clinicians.
- Q. Okay. And you are relying on those two clinicians for the proposition that all of the benefits I asked you questions about are outweighed

1 | by the costs?

MR. PENDELL: Objection.

- A. I'm relying on these clinical inputs for the statement that the net costs are positive of prescription opioids.
- Q. And did you do any calculation of the benefits of these prescription opioids? Or are you, instead, just relying on what you understand Doctor Lembke and Doctor Waller to have said?

 MR. PENDELL: Objection.
- A. I'm relying on their opinion that the net -- that the costs outweigh the benefits and that implies to me that the net costs are positive.
- Q. And are you relying on anything else besides Doctor Lembke and Doctor Waller for that proposition?
- A. No, I'm just relying on -- I'm just relying on those two clinicians.
- Q. And therefore having relied on Doctor

 Lembke and Doctor Waller for that proposition, you

 did not undertake to try to quantify or measure any

 of the benefits of using prescription opioids.

MR. PENDELL: Objection, asked and answered.

1 MR. KO: Objection.

2.4

- A. Well, my -- my task here was to estimate the net. And the net is cost minus benefits. So if I know the net -- or I have reliable opinions that the net is on the cost side, then that tells me what I need to know as an economist, and I can then conservatively as I did in my report treat that as zero.
- Q. Right. So to determine the net cost, you need to determine the costs and the benefits.

 Correct?
- A. Well, that's -- I mean, in a very general way, that would be correct. And there's different realms in which that question is asked here, and one of them is a clinical realm in which I relied on Lembke and Waller.
- Q. And on the cost side, you purported to independently measure and quantify those costs.
- A. In some case -- well, yes, in much of my report, I did quantify those costs.
- Q. And on the benefits side, rather than attempting to measure them, you are relying on Doctors Lembke and Waller for what you understand them to be saying, which is the costs outweigh the

1 benefits.

3

4

5

6

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

MR. PENDELL: Objection.

- A. Well, I'm relying on the clinicians, Lembke and Waller, to consider the clinical benefits and costs of prescription opioids and to come to a determination of from their perspective whether the clinical costs outweigh the clinical benefits, and that's how I read their reports.
- Q. Turning to the section of your report on mortality, I think starts with Paragraph 38 -Are you there?
 - A. Yes.
- Q. Okay. And you explain that you rely on Doctor Keyes' estimate of the number of deaths that are due to prescription opioids. Correct?
 - A. Yes, I see that.
- Q. And when you say, "due to prescription opioids," do you mean due to the sale and distribution of prescription opioids, or something else?
 - A. I mean by the sale and distribution of.
- Q. Okay. So you're relying on Doctor Keyes' estimate of the number of deaths that are due to the sale and distribution of prescription opioids?

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

2.4

- Yes. Α.
- 0. Did you do any independent work yourself to estimate the number of deaths that are due to the sale and distribution of prescription opioids?
- In this case, I relied on a very good epidemiologist, Professor Keyes, to provide those estimates.
- Ο. Right. But my question was whether you did any independent work.
 - Α. Oh.
- Did you do any independent work yourself to Ο. estimate the number of deaths that are due to the sale and distribution of prescription opioids.

MR. PENDELL: Objection to form.

- Well, the numbers here are ones that Professor Keyes provided. I obviously worked in this area to assess the costs, but the numbers are from Professor Keyes.
- Okay. And the numbers that Professor Keyes supplied are -- were originally set out in Table 2 of your report on page 20, correct?
 - That's correct. Α.
- Okay. And looking at the numbers in Table Ο. 2, when you got these numbers from Professor Keyes,

Veritext Legal Solutions 888-391-3376 www.veritext.com

did you do anything to see if they seemed reasonable to you?

A. Yes.

1

4

5

6

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

2.4

- Q. What did you do to evaluate whether the numbers that Professor Keyes had supplied seemed reasonable to you?
- A. Well, I think I looked at the magnitude overall in terms of what I would have expected for a community of the size of the Cabell community, and then roughly the timing of those.

I'm not surprised that they, you know, peaked in the -- whatever it is, 2017, in accordance with local reports. And I'm also -- I also would have looked at the composition in terms of direct and indirect prescription opioids.

And this also makes sense to me.

- Q. So you -- when you got these numbers that are reflected in Table 2 from Professor Keyes, you did look at them, and you did --
 - A. Yes.
- Q. -- some kind of reasonable evaluation yourself?
- A. Well, I looked at them and I just, you know, saw -- sort of mentally, you do this -- that

you get the table and you just, you know, see if it makes sense to you. You look at it, and you know, if it doesn't, you would say something.

2.3

2.4

But this made sense to you.

Q. Okay. It made sense to you, and I take it then you didn't say anything to Professor Keyes about these numbers. Is that correct?

MR. PENDELL: Objection.

- A. Well, I don't know if I said anything about the numbers, which is a more general question. But I don't recall any criticism of these numbers that I had -- I conveyed to her.
- Q. And when you were looking at them to see if the numbers made sense, did you consult any other sources of information, or was it just on the face of it, it looked reasonable to you?

MR. PENDELL: Objection to the form.

- A. I think in this case, I looked at the table and it was my own kind of review based on what I know about the situation, you know, was what I would have used to, you know, run a kind of mental check on the numbers.
- Q. Okay. When you were doing the mental check and you were looking at Professor Keyes' numbers,

did it occur to you that it seemed wrong or odd that under her calculations, in 2018, 100 percent of all deaths due to opioids were due to prescription opioids?

MR. PENDELL: Objection to form.

- A. No, it didn't occur to me.
- Q. Okay. How about the fact that under the numbers that Professor Keyes supplied, 97 percent of all deaths due to opioids were due to prescription opioids, according to her?

MR. PENDELL: Objection.

- A. Well, again, that doesn't -- it didn't strike me at the time. But I know there's a lot that are directly due and then a big chunk are indirectly due. So it didn't -- didn't strike me as odd at the time.
- Q. And for your valuation of deaths, you use the value of a statistical life?
 - A. Yes, I do.

1

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

2.4

- Q. Other than in the opioid cases in which you've been a testifying expert, have you ever used the value of a statistical life to quantify costs in a lawsuit?
 - A. No. This -- this is the only -- these are

- the only settings in the opioid cases in which I had that as part of my assignment.
- Q. Turning to Morbidity, which is a section that starts on page 22 of your report -- are you there?
- A. Yes.

1

2

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

- Q. -- you explain that you calculate morbidity costs by multiplying the number of OUD cases due to prescription opioids by the excess health care costs associated with the treatment of OUD and sequelae. Correct?
 - A. That's basically correct, yes.
- Q. Did you independently research the number of OUD cases that are due to prescription opioids?
 - A. In Cabell?
- 16 O. Yes.
 - A. Again, this is something that I relied on Professor Keyes for with respect to these counts. They are directly taken from her report.
 - Q. Okay. So did you do any independent research regarding the number of OUD cases in Cabell County that are due to prescription opioids?

 MR. PENDELL: Objection to form.
 - A. Well, you know, I worked in this area and

- used the numbers, but the numbers themselves came directly from Keyes.
 - Q. Okay. So you took from the Keyes report the number of residents of Cabell County with OUD?
 - A. Yes.

- Q. And you took from the Keyes report the number of OUD cases in Cabell County that she attributes directly to prescription opioids.
 - A. That's correct; yes, I did.
- Q. And you took from the Keyes report the number of OUD cases in Cabell County that she says are not directly due to prescription opioids but are indirectly due to prescription opioids.
 - A. That's also correct; I did.
- Q. Did you do anything to test any of those numbers?

MR. PENDELL: Objection.

- A. I read what she did. I thought it was a reasonable approach. That's -- I'm not sure what you mean by "test" other than kind of run it by yourself.
- Q. Okay. In Paragraph 48 of your report, you say "In the later years, cases of OUD due to non-prescription opioids attributable to

	Page 85
1	prescription opioids make up a larger share of the
2	total."
3	Do you see that?
4	A. I do see that, yes.
5	Q. What you do mean by that statement?
6	A. I mean that the fourth row of Table 4
7	accounts for a larger share of the fifth row in the
8	later years.
9	Q. Why is that, as you understand it?
10	MR. PENDELL: Objection.
11	A. I assume you're not asking a mathematical
12	question.
13	Q. Correct.
14	A. You're asking a question of what?
15	Q. What explains the phenomenon that you say
16	the numbers reflect?
17	A. What is the underlying kind of epidemiology
18	of disease that accounts for this? Would that be
19	what you're trying to get at?
20	Q. Sure. What explains that?
21	MR. PENDELL: Object.
22	Q. As you understand it. If you know.
23	A. I'm waiting for my counsel to object, but

hearing none --

24

MR. PENDELL: I did. I object. I objected. I'll be louder.

2.3

2.4

A. Well, there's -- you know, mathematically, that's not what you're asking about. You -- one level down, there's data. This is epidemiologic data that Professor Keyes is the expert in that comes in different types here with respect to OUD, that she classified as directly and potentially indirectly due to prescription opioids, and then she has an approach that - given that data - that generates these numbers.

That's, you know, one level of explanation -- that's -- the nature of her work in this is what led to this.

There's -- I suppose you can go further than that and ask what are the social processes that account for this, and, you know, there, I think it's stepping way outside my -- my expertise, so I'll just stop right there.

- Q. Regarding the excess health costs attributable to OUD, you cite three studies? Correct?
 - A. Where -- I'm sorry, where are you now?
 - Q. Turn to Paragraph 53 of your report.

- A. Okay. Well, that's correct. But there's more cited in Appendix C that are in the same flavor.
- Q. Okay. Well, you cite the Florence study, right?
- 6 A. Yes.

1

2

3

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

- Q. The Leslie study?
- 8 A. Yes.
 - Q. And what you describe as a recent study sponsored by the Society of Actuaries?
 - A. Yes. That's Davenport, is the first author of that, yes.
 - Q. And then you say in your report that you "primarily rely on these later two studies to quantify excess health care costs due to OUD."
 - A. That's --
 - Q. Why -- why not rely on the Florence study?

 MR. PENDELL: Objection.
 - A. Well, it's "primarily rely," and not just the Florence, but you know, other studies have looked at this with broadly the same methodology which I regard to be appropriate of mass controls and come up with pretty similar answers.

What I was -- the reason that I chose

Leslie and Davenport to be my primary sources of reliance for this purpose was to take into account as best I could the fact that this is occurring in Cabell County, not nationally, and Cabell County is different than the nation in some respects that are — will show up in data, and so I wanted to use that if I could, and these studies allow me to do that.

- Q. You discuss NAS or neonatal abstinence syndrome in your report? Right?
 - A. Yes, I do. May I just flip to that?
- 12 Q. Sure.

1

2

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.4

- A. Okay, I'm there.
- Q. You acknowledge that neonatal abstinence syndrome can be caused by in-utero exposure to chemicals other than opioids, right?
 - A. That's my understanding, yes.
- Q. So an infant can be diagnosed as having NAS even if the birth mother did not take any opioids during the pregnancy. Correct?
 - A. That's my understanding.
- Q. Okay. Did you do any independent research into the number of NAS births in Cabell County?
 - A. Well, this is, again, a count area where I

was aware of your questions that you asked earlier, and this was explicitly part of what Professor Keyes was going to do.

So being this is a question of epidemiology, it was left to her, and I relied on her estimates of the number of NAS babies.

- Q. Okay. So you get from Professor Keyes the estimated number of NAS births in Cabell County?
 - A. That's correct, I do.

2.4

- Q. Did you do any independent research into what percentage of NAS births in Cabell County are attributable to the fetus being exposed to opioids?

 MR. PENDELL: Object to the form.
- A. Well, I don't know if "independent research" is the right term. This was a subject of discussion with some of the local medical experts who thought it was predominantly an issue of prescription opioids. But again, I didn't attempt to sort through the local and the national evidence on this, but relied on Professor Keyes to do that.
- Q. You referred to "local medical experts" in your prior answer. Who are you referring to specifically?
 - A. You know, I don't remember. You know, it's

nothing I relied on for my opinion, and if I had, I would have, you know, done my best to write that down.

But I remember discussion with a pediatrician who thought NAS is increasing in Cabell County. It's extremely costly. There's follow-up stuff that happens that, you know, is just terrible for the baby and family, and that most of these are attributable to prescription opioids, even if not 100 percent are.

- Q. For your calculations, you assume that 50 percent of the number of NAS births in Cabell County are due to opioids. Correct?
- A. Well, that's how I proceed here. And I believe I described the basis for that, which was the opinion that a majority were and "majority" is a word that doesn't have a percentage associated with it, but majority is at least 50 percent in my understanding. So that's why I used 50 percent.
- Q. And in your report, you say that to support your assumption, you're relying on Professor Keyes' statement that, quote, "The majority of neonatal abstinence syndrome among US infants is due to opioid exposure in utero." Correct?

- 1 A. Yeah. Well, you're reading somewhere.
- 2 Q. I'm reading from Paragraph 72 of your 3 report --
- 4 A. Yeah, that's --
- 5 O. -- first sentence.
 - A. Yeah, that's -- that sounds accurate, yes.
- Q. Okay. Do you know what Professor Keyes' statement is based on?
- 9 A. Well, I would have when I had read her 10 report, but right now, I'm -- I can't tell you.
- Q. And that statement that you quote from Professor Keyes is about NAS cases among U.S.
- 13 infants, correct?

6

- 14 A. Yes, that's correct.
- 15 Q. So it's not specific to Cabell County, 16 right?
- A. Well, it's -- it's U.S. Not -- it's not specific to Cabell County.
- 19 Q. For the other NAS cases that are not due to
 20 in-utero exposure to opioids, what are the
 21 chemicals that cause the NAS?
- MR. PENDELL: Objection to form.
- 23 Outside the scope.
- A. I really -- probably other drugs, but it's

- outside the scope of my report. I'm not in a position to say.
 - Q. Well, what other drugs?

 MR. PENDELL: Objection.

2.3

2.4

- A. Drugs that are potentially addictive, I suppose. But I -- again, it's outside my scope. I'm not sure.
- Q. Okay. So you started with the number of NAS births in Cabell County, and you got that number from Professor Keyes, and then you assumed that 50 percent of those NAS births were due to opioids. Correct?
 - A. That's correct.
- Q. And then you needed to determine of the NAS cases that are attributable to the birth mother using opioids during pregnancy, what share are due to prescription opioids. Right?
 - A. That's right. Correct.
- Q. What does "due to prescription opioids" mean?
- A. It means here the same thing it meant in the previous table with respect to morbidity. That "due to" would be either directly due to addiction due to prescription opioids or indirectly due to

- prescription opioids. It's both of those together.
 - Q. Okay. So you're saying, "due to prescription opioids" means directly due to prescription opioids and indirectly due to prescription opioids.
 - A. Yes, that's a good summary.

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

2.4

- Q. Okay. What does "directly due to prescription opioids" mean?
- A. Well, it means in the context of morbidity, where this estimate comes from, that the -- that the opioid that the patient is addicted to is prescription opioids.
 - Q. And what does "indirectly due to" mean?
- A. It means if the -- the you know, person who was ill may be addicted to some other substance for example, heroin that the reason they are addicted to heroin is due to prescription opioids.
- Q. And what does that mean "due to prescription opioids?"
- A. It means but for their use of prescription opioids, they would not have been addicted.
- Q. So when you are determining the share of NAS cases that are attributable to using opioids that are due to prescription opioids, does that

mean the percentage of NAS cases that are attributable to the birth mother using prescription opioids during pregnancy, or does it mean something else?

MR. PENDELL: Objection to form.

- A. Yes, it means something else.
- O. What does it mean?

1

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

2.4

A. It means the -- it's an estimate. And it's an estimate of the share of disease of opioid use disorder that is due to prescription opioids. So I have a number, using this 50 percent conservative assumption, of babies who are born with NAS due to opioids.

The ultimate question I need an answer to is how many of them are due to prescription opioids, and so that is -- is estimated by the share of morbidity in Cabell County that is due to prescription opioids in the way that is discussed around the morbidity tables.

- Q. Okay. And again, those percentages are derived from numbers that you receive from Professor Keyes.
 - A. That's correct.
 - Q. You assume -- this is in Paragraph 72 of

your report. You assume that the share of NAS births due to prescription opioids is the same as the share of OUD due to prescription opioids.

A. That's correct.

- Q. And the share of OUD cases due to prescription opioids is not something you calculated. Right?
- A. That's again -- I -- it's whatever table it was previously. Those numbers come from -- directly from Professor Keyes' report.
- Q. So you relied on Professor Keyes for the share of OUD cases due to prescription opioids.
 - A. Yes, I did.
- Q. So you are relying on Professor Keyes for the share of NAS births attributable to opioids that are attributable to prescription opioids in particular. Correct?

MR. PENDELL: Objection to form.

A. Well, this is a question of epidemiology that we're discussing right now. Disease counts, which is -- which is the bread and butter of epidemiology. It's not the bread and butter of an economist, so I, you know, quite confidently could rely on a first rate epidemiologist to give me the

information I needed to be able to do a disease count, which is what we're discussing here.

So I relied on a very good one, Professor Keyes, to do that.

2.4

- Q. What is the basis for your assumption that the share of NAS births due to prescription opioids is the same as the share of OUD due to prescription opioids?
- A. Well, the basis of that assumption is that babies born with NAS are born to mothers who are -- have a opioid use problem. And of those mothers -- if you wanted an estimate of what share of those mothers with an opioid use problem are due to prescription opioids, well, we just happen to have a share estimate of that morbidity that we've computed earlier.

So that's the basis. I think it's mother's disease causes NAS; what share of mother's disease is prescription opioids. We've estimated that, so I think it's a pretty good assumption.

Q. You acknowledge that NAS can be caused by in-utero exposure to opioids that were taken by the birth mother as prescribed. Right?

MR. PENDELL: Objection.

- A. I actually don't know the degree to which

 -- you know, what level of risks are associated

 with different things. I -- it's not something I

 can help you with.
- Q. Well, I'm not asking you to quantify anything. I'm -- my question is: Do you acknowledge that NAS can be caused by in-utero exposure to opioids that were taken by the birth mother as prescribed?

MR. PENDELL: Objection to form. Outside the scope.

- A. You know, I'm sorry, I don't really know.
- Q. Okay. Would you look at page -- Paragraph 67 of your report? Are you there?
 - A. Yes.

- Q. Okay. Second sentence of Paragraph 67 in your report says, quote, "It" meaning NAS "can occur due to any regular antenatal opioid use, including whether opioids are taken as prescribed or non-medically." Do you see that?
 - A. I see that.
- Q. Okay. So NAS can result from a birth mother's use of opioids pursuant to a prescription.
 - A. Well, it looks like that there's at least

1 | some reference to support that statement.

2.4

Q. And so when you acknowledge that NAS can occur due to any regular antenatal opioid use - meaning use before birth - including when opioids are taken as prescribed, you're acknowledging it can result from opioid use taken pursuant to a prescription written by a licensed physician.

Correct?

- A. Yeah, it looks like that's possible.

 MR. PENDELL: Objection.
- Q. How many of the NAS cases included in your quantification involved the birth mother taking opioids as prescribed by her licensed physician?

 MR. PENDELL: Objection.
- A. Well, this is -- you're coming back to questions of epidemiology where I'm kind of on the edge on this. And again, this is something that Professor Keyes would have considered and dealt with, and I use her numbers.
- Q. Okay. Does she address how many of the NAS cases included in her count involved the birth mother taking opioids as prescribed by her licensed physician?

MR. PENDELL: Objection to form.

A. I'm not sure how she went this -- about this. So I'm -- I can't tell you right now.

2.4

Q. Do physicians on occasion prescribe an opioid to a pregnant woman to help her manage a preexisting addiction during pregnancy?

MR. PENDELL: Objection to form.

- A. I'm not really in a position to say.
- Q. You don't know one way or the other?
- A. I don't know one way or the other.
- Q. How many of the NAS cases included in your quantification involved babies who are born to a birth mother who was taking a prescription opioid as prescribed by her licensed physician to help her manage a preexisting addiction during pregnancy?

MR. KO: To the form.

MR. PENDELL: Objection, yeah.

- A. Well, that's very far into the weeds. That also would have been something that Professor Keyes took into account. The epidemiologist, not the economist.
- Q. Did Professor Keyes' count of NAS cases account for babies who were born to a birth mother who was taking a prescription opioid as prescribed by her licensed physician to help her manage a

preexisting addiction during pregnancy?

1

2

4

5

6

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

MR. KO: Objection to form.

MR. PENDELL: Objection.

A. Well, again, I don't recall exactly what Professor Keyes did, but her statement that the majority of NAS cases are due to OUD is one that, you know, allows for lots of other situations in which a baby may be born with NAS.

So there's nothing inconsistent with the statement that the majority are if you have examples that sometimes it is not.

And I would have expected Professor

Keyes to, you know, be aware of the "sometimes they are not" and I'm sure she was, so there's no reason that what you're -- this -- sort of these questions, are ones that would cause me to doubt the reliability of the assumption that -- my conservative assumption that 50 percent only of the NAS cases are due to opioid use disorder.

- Q. Are you drawing a separation between mothers who have opioid use disorder and mothers who are taking a prescribed opioid to help manage a preexisting condition?
 - A. Well, that's again a question of

- epidemiology. And if the person -- if the mother

 has opioid use disorder, then -- and you have a NAS

 baby, that may well have been due to prescription

 opioids.
 - But the distinction between who is taking and who has OUD is one that is also squarely within Professor Keyes' expertise, and I know she addressed that in her report.
 - Q. You purport to value the economic harm from child maltreatment by multiplying the number of victims where prescription opioids were involved by the costs associated with this maltreatment.
- 13 | Correct?

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

16

17

20

2.4

- 14 A. That's broadly correct, but give me a hint 15 about where this paragraph is.
 - Q. Sure. Paragraph 100.
 - A. Well, okay. It's -- yes, I'm there.
- 18 Q. Okay. Do you see that sentence at the beginning of Paragraph 100?
 - A. Yes.
- Q. Okay. What is the definition of
 "maltreatment" when you're attempting to value the
 economic harm from child maltreatment?
 - A. This is a field of child welfare, and

"maltreatment" can be neglect or abuse. And I think we know what those mean.

2.3

2.4

- Q. Did you pull any data from any Cabell County source about the number of children who are maltreated in that county?
- A. Well, my methodology is here. And I know I had to use some West Virginia numbers for some percentages, and then the data I used for Cabell had to do with the number of kids in Cabell.
- Q. Right. But my question is specific. Did you pull any data from any Cabell County source about the number of children who are maltreated in that county?

MR. PENDELL: Objection to form.

- A. Well, the number is Cabell data; the number of kids is Cabell data. The share of kids who are maltreated is a West Virginia number.
- Q. Okay. Did you look for any data specific to children in Cabell County who are maltreated?

 MR. PENDELL: Objection to form.
- A. I think I probably would have been interested in that. I don't remember -- I don't remember the details. But I know -- remember asking that question and determining that this was

the best source of an estimate.

1

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

2.4

- Q. So what -- when you -- when you looked for data specific to children in Cabell County who were maltreated, what did you find?
- A. See, I don't remember the details of what

 -- the limitations or availability of local data

 would be with respect to maltreatment, so I'm

 sorry, I don't remember.
- Q. So the analysis you did relied on data you pulled from the Department of Health and Human Services Administration for Children and Families?
 - A. Well, that's some of the data, yes.
- Q. Okay. And where does the Administration for Children and Families get its data?

MR. PENDELL: Objection to form.

- A. I believe from child welfare agencies.
- O. In the various states?
- A. In the various states.
 - Q. Did you --
- A. Sorry. Excuse me. There could be other -there could be other sources. I'm not 100 percent
 familiar with it.
- Q. Okay. Do you know where else, if anywhere, the Administration for Children and Families gets

- its data other than from child protective agencies
 in the states?
- MR. PENDELL: Objection to form.
- A. I have to go -- I'd have to go back and look. I don't recall right now.
 - Q. Okay. Did you seek any data from any child protective agency in West Virginia?
 - A. I don't think I made any direct requests that I remember.
 - Q. Okay. So you went to the Department of Health and Human Services Administration for Children and Families and you requested data for West Virginia?
 - A. Yes.
 - Q. Okay. And you say that you could -- you could not get data from the Administration for Children and Families for certain years. Correct?
 - A. That's also correct, yes.
 - Q. So the Administration for Children and Families was not able to provide West Virginia data for 2006, 2007, 2008, 2009, 2013 and 2015.
- 22 | Correct?

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

A. Well, I'm -- if you don't mind pointing me to where you're seeing that.

- Q. Sure. Why don't you look at your Footnote 2 183.
 - A. Yes, okay. Your statement --
 - Q. Okay. And so for those years 2006, 2007, 2008, 2009, 2013 and 2015 you had to estimate counts for those years, correct?
 - A. That's correct, yes.
 - Q. Okay. So having gone to the Administration for Children and Families and gotten its data for West Virginia for certain years, but not all of them, you then estimated counts for the missing years.
 - A. That's correct.
- That's my phone. Sorry. I'm ignoring it.
- 16 Q. It is? Okay.
- 17 A. Yes.

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

21

22

23

2.4

- 18 Q. I was checking my phone just in case.
- A. Yes, I could tell. Everyone was probably,

 "Oh my gawd, I got a call."
 - Q. And then you -- based on the data you have and extrapolating across the years for which you did not have data, you estimated the number of first-time victims of child maltreatment with a

drug abuse risk factor. Correct?

- A. That's correct.
- Q. Did you assign the drug of use risk factor to those first-time victims?
 - A. That's in the data.
- Q. That's in the data you got from the Administration for Children and Families?
 - A. Yes.

1

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

- Q. Does the Administration for Children and Families assign the drug abuse risk factor?

 MR. PENDELL: Objection to form.
- A. Well, it would have been from whatever data source would have done that assignment. I don't think they did it at that level.
- Q. Okay. So you didn't assign it, and you don't think the Administration for Children and Families assigned it? Do you think it's in the data that was reported to the administration for child and families?
 - A. That would be my assumption, yeah.
- Q. Okay. And so for the West Virginia data, you believed the drug abuse risk factor would have been assigned by a child protective agency for West Virginia?

1 MR. PENDELL: Objection to form.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

2.4

- A. Whatever the reporting agency is. I'm -- that's really all I can say.
- Q. What child protective agency or agencies in West Virginia provided the data that the Administration for Children and Families has for West Virginia?

MR. PENDELL: Objection to form.

- A. I'd have to go back and look. I can't tell you off the top of my head.
- Q. Okay. And what does a drug abuse risk factor mean in the data for West Virginia?
- A. It means a caregiver who is, in this context, mostly parents, but not always parents uses drugs.
- Q. Who -- who assigns the drug abuse risk factor to a particular case?

MR. PENDELL: Objection to form.

- A. Now, here again, it's a little bit more detailed than I can answer right now. Caseworker, but I'm not sure.
 - Q. Okay. And you believe it's a caseworker?

 MR. PENDELL: Objection.
 - A. I said it could be a caseworker. I'm not

sure who does the assignment of the data.

1

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

Q. If not a caseworker, who would assign the drug abuse risk factor to a particular case?

MR. PENDELL: Objection.

- A. Well, it could be someone who gets a report from a caseworker and then makes a determination.
- Q. And what are the criteria used for deciding whether to assign a drug abuse risk factor to a particular case?

MR. PENDELL: Objection to form.

- A. That's, again, more detailed than I can answer off the top of my head.
- Q. Does it require a finding that the maltreatment was caused by drug abuse by a caregiver?

MR. PENDELL: Objection to form.

- A. Again, I'm not sure. It's too much detail for me to know sitting here.
 - Q. Does it require a finding that there was drug abuse by someone in the family?

MR. PENDELL: Objection to form.

- A. This is too much detail. I'm sorry. I can't answer that question now.
 - Q. Can a drug abuse risk factor be assigned to

a case based on assess -- an assessment that there was a risk of drug abuse by the caregiver or the family?

MR. PENDELL: Objection to form.

- A. I'm not sure I totally understand the question, but I do -- I do think it's probably too much detail for me to be able to answer.
- Q. Okay. I'm trying to understand based on your understanding of this data how is a drug abuse risk factor assigned to a particular case?

 Is it that someone has concluded that in fact there was drug abuse? Or is it that the child's home or the child's caregivers are at risk of abusing drugs?

MR. PENDELL: Object to the form.

- A. My understanding, it's the former, not the latter.
 - Q. What is your understanding based on?
- A. It's reading the material that fed into this analysis.
 - Q. What material?
- A. The report that we've been referring to.
- Q. The report from the Administration for Children and Families?

1 A. Yes.

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

- Q. Okay. What -- where is that report cited in your report?
 - A. Probably here, but certainly -- it's right in 183 -- Footnote 183 but -- and Footnote 176 and elsewhere.
 - Q. You then estimated the percentage of first-time victims with a drug risk factor who live in Cabell County. Correct?
 - A. Correct.
 - Q. And you did that by comparing the total number of children in Cabell County to the total number of children in West Virginia?
 - A. Give me a paragraph, please, I'll -- then I'll confirm.
 - Q. It's Paragraph 103 again, if you need a reference.
 - A. Well, it just helps me to take a look.

 Yes, that's what I did.
 - Q. Okay. So you -- you calculated a ratio of the total number of children in Cabell County to the total number of children in West Virginia and then you applied that ratio to the total number of first-time victims with a drug abuse risk factor to

identify the percentage of those victims who live in Cabell County?

1

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

2.4

A. That's basically correct. And if I could just editorialize a little bit on this method, it's conservative.

Cabell has it worse than the state, so I felt that (Zoom audio glitch) figures derived in this way are probably a lower bound than what the real numbers are.

- Q. You said Cabell county has it worse -- worse than the rest of the state --
- A. In terms of the impact of the opioid crisis.
- Q. Okay. Including with respect to child maltreatment.
- A. Including with the things that the opioid crisis causes, including child maltreatment.
- Q. So you -- you assume there's no variation in the rate of child maltreatment across West Virginia?
 - MR. PENDELL: Objection to form.
- A. No, I didn't assume that. I assumed that the West Virginia numbers were a undercount of what I was going to see in Cabell. And so using the

West Virginia numbers, give a informative estimate, and it's an informative -- I would call a lower bound of what the numbers are.

So when I'm interested in computing a net cost number or I'm counting children who are maltreated and then assessing the cost to those children, I come up with a number that is -- I mean, the quote/unquote real number would be at least as big as that.

Q. So you now -- at this point in your methodology, you've identified the number of first-time victims with a drug abuse risk factor who live in Cabell County. Right?

And then the next step was to determine the percentage of those victims where the drug involved opioids?

MR. PENDELL: Object to the form.

A. That's correct.

4

5

6

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- Q. And you did that by -- by applying the percentage of drug seizures that involved opioids?
 - A. Yes, that's also correct.
- Q. What is your basis for using that percentage as a -- as a proxy for the drug abuse risk factor involving opioids?

1 MR. PENDELL: Objection.

A. Well, it's a -- I think it's a reasonable estimate of the share of overall drug. So I have from the West Virginia data drug abuse risk factors, and I don't want to be, you know, overly -- I don't want to count too much and attribute all of that to opioids. Even though in Cabell County, I think it could be said with confidence that opioids, in relation to drug abuse, are much higher than it would be on the national level.

So that's sort of underlying thing that's feeding into my thinking here. And so if I take a national number that is the ratio of opioid to other drugs - which I can get through this seizure reporting information - that, again, is a -- an estimate I can be confident is a lower bound on what that ratio would be in Cabell County.

So that's -- that's how I can confidently use a national number.

Q. And then you attempt to estimate the percentage of first-time victims with a drug abuse factor who live in Cabell County where the drug involved opioids that are attributable to prescription opioids.

- A. Yeah, I had to go through --
- Q. Is that correct?

1

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

- A. I had to do that too.
- Q. Okay. And so you take the number of first-time victims with a drug abuse risk factor who live in Cabell County where you believe the drug involved opioids, and you multiply it by the opioid morbidity attributable to prescription opioids, again using the numbers that you got from Professor Keyes.
 - A. That's what I did, yes.
- Q. Okay. And as a result of this, your calculations purport to show that 97.5 percent of all child maltreatment cases in 2006 are attributable to prescription opioids.
 - A. I'm sorry, where are you now?
- 17 | O. Well --
- A. That doesn't sound quite right, but let me

 -- where are you finding those numbers?
- Q. Well, let's go back to --
- 21 A. If you say it again, maybe I can figure
 22 out --
- 23 Q. Well, I'm trying to find table --
- A. I see that the numbers in Table 9, you have

1 to look back at Attachment C to figure out where
2 they came from.

Take a look at Table 9.

O. Yeah.

A. 3, 2, 2, 4. This methodology doesn't lead to - on the face - what seemed to me to be too high. If anything, I see 2011, four kids in Cabell County maltreated because of prescription opioids?

I know that's kind of a impression, but that's -- if you're trying to argue that that's an overestimate, I don't know. I just don't know where you're coming from.

- Q. I'm not arguing anything. I'm asking you questions.
- A. I know. But if you're trying to make that point and you see four in 2011, I don't know. I just don't know.
- Q. So the number -- the figures in your Table 9, the first row, you're saying that's the number of children who are maltreated by someone who was, what, using prescription opioids?
- A. No, this is -- no. It's -- it's analogous to the questions I tried to address earlier. It's the maltreatment due to prescription opioids with

the kind of model or idea that prescription opioids can cause disease, and it's people who are ill with opioid use disorder - either directly or indirectly due to prescriptions - who are those that provide -- who that create a risk to a child.

And so it's prescriptions, to disease, to risk of maltreatment. And you know, the various factoring down that we've been discussing -- you factor down because not all drugs are opioids; you factor down because not all opioids are prescription opioids, then --

But with that factoring down of the number of children who are maltreated, you come up with these numbers. That's -- that's the basic idea here.

- Q. You submitted an errata sheet on August 24th, 2020, correct?
 - A. Yes, I did.
- Q. Do you have a copy of that errata sheet in front of you?
 - A. I can put one in front of me.
- 22 O. Please do so.
- 23 A. Okay.

Q. Do you have it in front of you?

- 1 A. I do, yes.
- Q. Okay. And the errata sheet appears to have two sections. One section is titled "Harm
- 4 Valuation Changes." Right?
- 5 A. Yes.

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

19

20

21

2.4

- Q. And the other is titled "Typographical and Citation Changes." Right?
 - A. That's correct.
- Q. Okay. Is it accurate to say that all of the harm valuation changes listed in this errata sheet are the result of getting new numbers from Professor Keyes?
- A. Well, I listed here the reason. And in every one of the cases in that Harm Valuation
 Changes, it's due to an input change from Doctor
 Keyes, Professor Keyes.
- Q. When did you get these input changes from Professor Keyes?
 - A. I think it was about a week later. A week after the submission of her original report.
 - Q. Okay. So roughly August 10th?
- A. Yeah. I'm not sure exactly, but not long after.
 - Q. And what did you get on August 10th? Did

- you get a revised report that had new numbers?
- A. No. I got a revised set of in -- what I would call the input numbers. In the form -- it comes in an Excel spreadsheet.
 - Q. Okay. And who supplied that Excel spreadsheet with the new numbers that were input changes from Professor Keyes?
 - A. Someone that works with Professor Keyes.
 - Q. Okay. And prior to receiving that spreadsheet, had you received a heads-up that Professor Keyes was revising the numbers in her report?
 - A. I don't think so. But -- no, I didn't receive a heads-up.
 - Q. Prior to receiving the spreadsheet, were you aware that the numbers in Professor Keyes' original report were inaccurate?
- 18 A. No, I was not.

1

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

- Q. When you got the spreadsheet, what did you do with it?
 - A. What my staff did with it was to substitute the previous input numbers that we'd been using from Professor Keyes that, you know, flow through the report. And I think you can see with all the

changes that are necessary from the change in Professor Keyes' numbers that, you know, the inputs change, and then there's a series of Excel files that produce tables and figures that themselves changed.

2.3

2.4

So thankfully, to the magic of Excel, you know, one is able to do something like that relatively quickly.

- Q. So did -- did someone on your team input the updated corrected figures from Professor Keyes into your -- your report?
- A. That -- I mean, that's -- it sounds a little bit more by hand than it actually was. But yes. The inputs came from Professor Keyes, and then they were fed into the Excel spreadsheets that produced the tables in my report.
- Q. When you got the spreadsheet from Professor Keyes with the updated corrected numbers, did you follow up with Professor Keyes to understand what led to those changes or corrections?
- A. I asked my staff about this. I didn't talk to Professor Keyes directly.
 - Q. Who on your staff did you ask?
 - A. Adrian Garcia.

Q. And what did Adrian tell you?

2.4

A. Well, there was two kind of groups of -- if I can call them corrections, to Professor Keyes' report, one having to do with morbidity, and there -- there was a year - a single year, 2010 - where something was .053 and it should have been .043. I can't remember exactly what the entry refers to.

But that, I understood to have been a typo. That someone on her end had entered in the wrong number.

Then the other source of corrections had to do with mortality, and it had to do with a subset of the years of mortality from 2013 to 2018. And my understanding of what happened there is that on Professor Keyes' end, there was an inadvertent inclusion of a table that wasn't -- or a figure that wasn't the final figure, so it --

That -- it's kind of a mistake, but I don't know beyond -- that's my understanding of what -- that's what Adrian explained to me.

Q. Okay. So what you've offered is what you heard from Adrian, not what you heard from Professor Keyes.

1 A. That's correct.

3

4

5

6

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

- Q. And there were two groups of corrections:
 The first one involved morbidity and the second one involved mortality?
 - A. That's correct.
- Q. And for the second category, mortality, you said there was an inadvertent inclusion of a nonfinal figure in Professor Keyes' calculations for Years 2013 through 20118?
 - A. Some -- yeah, something like that.
 - Q. And who -- who identified the error?

 MR. PENDELL: Objection to form.
 - A. I'm not sure.
 - Q. Who on Professor Keyes' team corrected it?

 MR. PENDELL: Objection to form.
 - A. I'm also not sure about that.
- Q. Okay. And then after Adrian Garcia told you of these errors, did you give Adrian instructions on how to revise and update and correct your report?
 - A. Yes.
- Q. And how long did it take for Adrian to update your report based on the corrected figures from Professor Keyes?

A. An amazingly short period of time. I don't know in terms of days or hours, but not long. You know, once the inputs -- the input Excel files are set up, the actual -- you know, producing the actual Excel results happens, you know, very quickly.

And then the report has to go in and be modified, numbers changed and narrative changes.

That takes a little bit longer.

But I was in -- I guess I'm not shocked, but I was impressed how quickly the whole thing could get turned around.

- Q. So having received the spreadsheet from Professor Keyes on August 10th or so, when was your revised report finalized?
- A. Oh, gosh. When it was submitted. I don't remember exactly the date.
 - Q. Okay.

2.4

MR. PENDELL: Andy, I didn't want to interrupt this line of questioning, but at some point, if we could think about lunch. We've been going for a while, and I don't know if Professor McGuire is hungry, but I definitely am.

MR. KEYES: Sure, sure, okay.

- Q. The second set of changes in the errata sheet are corrections of citations and corrections of typographical errors?
 - A. Yes.

1

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

- Q. And who identified those errors as issues that needed to be corrected?
 - A. This was my staff at Greylock McKinnon.
 - Q. I'm sorry, your staff and what?
- A. Some member of the staff at Greylock

 McKinnon. I don't know what individual actually

 did it.
- Q. Okay. And since submitting this errata sheet on August 24th, have you identified any other errors?
- 15 A. No, I haven't.
- 16 Q. Okay.
- MR. KEYES: Let's go off the record.
- 18 VIDEO OPERATOR: Going off the record.
- 19 | The time is 12:04 p.m.
- 20 (A recess was taken for lunch after
- 21 which the proceedings continued as
- 22 follows:)
- VIDEO OPERATOR: This begins Media
- 24 | Unit 4 in the deposition of Tom McGuire. We're

- back on the record. The time is 12:56 p.m.
 BY MR. KEYES:
 - Q. Professor McGuire, you have a section on the economic harms that result from crime that are attributable to or due to prescription opioids.

 Can you walk us through how you estimated the number of crimes in the Cabell/Huntington community that are attributable to the sales and distribution of prescription opioids?
 - A. Okay. I'm going to open my report to that section, and I'll essentially step through the analysis there. So let me just get there first.
 - Q. Sure.

A. Okay. So it begins at Paragraph 78. And I'll give you a high level overview, Counsel, and then whatever you want to follow up on, then we can talk about that.

So at a high level, the idea is similar to the approaches that have been taken to the other areas of harms and costs, and it's in two parts.

The first part is to do the count part, which is to - in this case - estimate the number of crimes in the Cabell/Huntington community that are attributable to prescription opioids, and then to

- 1 | value them in terms of dollars to get a net cost.
- And I understand you're asking about the first part.
- 4 Q. Correct.

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

- A. So -- I can keep talking if you want.
- Q. No. So my question is about the first part.
- A. Okay.
 - Q. How did you estimate the number?
- A. That's what I thought. And with regard to the number, the initial step is to obtain a count of the total crimes in the Cabell/Huntington community that -- from all the law enforcement agencies over this time period.

And that involves a kind of national incidence-based reporting system which is -- I think it's maintained by the FBI.

-- that does that -- that collects that information. But the reporting to that is -- my understanding is voluntary. So not all the LEAs - which are the law enforcement agencies - who would have information about crimes in this community would necessarily report to the FBI each year.

So I started with the national data

that's reported by the local agencies, and then I noticed which agencies and which years were not reported, and then I went to those agencies directly - or my staff went to those agencies directly - and requested the information.

2.4

And in a number of cases, we got that information. So that was added into the aggregate.

And as you know from my report, the reporting of crimes is in various categories. Even after this follow-up, not all law enforcement agencies were able to provide us with the data, so there's -- we're missing some, which makes what I've done undercount.

But what I have is the ones that reported to the NIR -- NIBRS and then the ones that reported to us directly.

So that gives kind of a total: Here are all the crimes that were in the Cabell community during this time period.

And then the question I was interested in is: What share of those crimes can be attributable to prescription drugs? And here, I treated the try -- crimes -- sorry -- in two different categories. One is drug-related crimes,

and the other is what you would call - I don't know
- nondrug-related crimes.

2.3

2.4

Or sorry, drug crimes and other crimes.

Drug crimes are all due to drugs. Then the -- I had to step down from all drugs to opioids, then from opioids to attributable to prescriptions. So that was done in two steps. And we can talk about those if you'd like.

And then in the case of the nondrug crimes, some of those will be due to drugs and some of them to prescription opioids ultimately, and there was three steps.

I had to go from the count -- crime count itself and derive the share of those that was attributable to drugs, and then among those attributable to drugs, what share of those were attributable to opioids, and then among those that were opioids, what share were attributable to prescription opioids.

So it's a -- I guess a two-step process with respect to the drug crimes and a three-step process with respect to the nondrug crimes.

Q. Okay. You said that you started with the data from the National Incident-Based Reporting

System or NIBRS?

1

4

5

6

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

2.4

- A. Yes. That was one of the sources.
- Q. And you started with the data from NIBRS for Cabell County, but there were some gaps in that information, and so your staff requested data directly from certain law enforcement agencies?
 - A. That's correct, yes.
 - Q. Who on your staff made that request?
 - A. I believe it was Adrian Garcia.
- Q. And what specifically did Adrian Garcia request from those law enforcement agencies?
- A. He requested the information that would have been reported to the NIBRS.
- Q. Okay. And did the data that he received from these law enforcement agencies identify which of the crimes were drug-related?
- A. Well, some. The -- and some are drug crimes. So to that degree that -- yes, this is the same classification that the NIBRS uses.
- Q. But for the crimes that are reported outside the category of drug crimes, did the data show which of those crimes were drug-related?
- A. No. The data at that level did not show that, which was why the -- with respect to the

crimes in that category, there were three steps instead of two and the methodology I described a few minutes ago.

- Q. Okay. And then for the data that you received from NIBRS for Cabell County and the data you received directly from the law enforcement agencies in Cabell County, whatever drug crimes were reported, you said they're 100 percent due to drugs.
 - A. That's right.

2.4

- Q. And for all the drug -- all of the crimes in the other categories, you then needed to estimate the percentage of crimes in each category that could be attributable to any kind of drugs.

 Right?
- A. That's correct. That was the first step in that last category, yes.
- Q. And to do that, you took the percentage of all crimes in each category that are attributable to drugs as provided by the U.S. Department of Justice National Drug Intelligence Center?
- A. I believe that's correct. If you want me to confirm that precisely, I can do that if you remind me where this is happening in the report.

- Q. Well, you say that in Paragraph 23 of Section 4, Appendix C.
 - A. Okay.
 - Q. Tell me when you're there.
- 5 A. I'm there.

4

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

2.4

- Q. Okay. Are you in Appendix C --
- A. I'm sorry.
 - Q. -- Section 4, Paragraph 23?
 - A. Yeah, I'm looking at it now.
 - Q. Okay. And you say, "I adjust the number of crimes identified in the NIBRS data and individual" law enforcement agencies "to estimate crimes attributable to prescription opioids in three steps. First, the percent of all crimes in each category that can be attributable to drugs (opioids and non-opioids) is taken from the" U.S. Department of Justice National Drug Intelligence Center."

See that?

- A. Yeah, I'm following along.
- Q. Okay. So is that statistic a national statistic of what percentage of crimes in each category are attributable to drugs?
 - A. I think it is a national statistic, yes.
 - Q. Okay. Did you undertake to find any

- similar statistic that was specific to West Virginia?
 - A. I don't remember. I don't think so. This, again, would have been a lower bound, because West Virginia and Cabell in particular are harder hit than the rest of the country.
 - Q. And did you undertake to review any Cabell County-specific data to determine the percentage of crimes in each category that are attributable to drugs?
 - A. Yeah, I think the same answer. The -- I wasn't aware of any such data, and the national data, I'm very comfortable with as being a lower bound on what's going on in Cabell.
 - Q. And then having estimated the share of crimes that are drug-related, you then wanted to estimate the share that are opioid-related, right?
 - A. That's also correct, yes.
 - Q. And you say here in Paragraph 24 that you followed the methodology in the Florence study.
 - A. Yes.

4

5

6

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

- Q. Okay. And what was that methodology?
- A. Well, I think the next sentence explains
 that. This is drug seizures. The methodology was

from Florence. The data come from LEAs in Cabell.

- Ο. All right. So what was the methodology?
- Well, the methodology is to look at drug seizures and attribute to opioids the share that they comprise of drug seizures.
- Okay. And so where did you look at the Cabell-specific data to determine what percentage of the drug seizures were seizures of opioids?
- Α. Well, it has -- this -- the next sentence describes that, in the National Forensic Laboratory Information Service.
- Okay. And what does the National Forensic Q. Laboratory Information Service provide regarding drug seizures in Cabell County?
- Well, I would have to go back and check what level of aggregation this is, geographic. I'm not sure right now.
- Okay. Was it specific to Cabell County or Ο. was it state-wide for West Virginia?
- I -- I'm doubtful that it was Cabell. So Α. it's more likely to have been state.
- 22 Okay. Was it state-wide data or was it 0. national data? 2.3
 - Α. You didn't tell me I was going to have

Veritext Legal Solutions 888-391-3376 www.veritext.com

1

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.4

three choices. I -- I'm actually not sure. I'd have to go back and look.

2.4

- Q. Okay. But you did then estimate the percentage of drug-related crimes that were opioid-related, and your third step was then to determine of the opioid-related crimes, what percentage are attributable to prescription opioid sales and distribution?
- A. That's -- that's the -- that's right.

 That's the third step.
- Q. Okay. And that third step then uses the rate of OUD that's attributable to prescription sales and distribution as calculated and reported by Professor Keyes. Correct?
 - A. That's also correct, yes.
- Q. Okay. So you undertook to identify the number of crimes in each category. You undertook then to determine a percentage of the crimes in each category that are drug-related.

You used some data from the National Forensic Laboratory Information Service to determine what percentage of the drug-related crimes were opioid-related; and then of the opioid-related crimes, you determined what

percentage were due to prescription opioid sales and distribution by using the percentages that Professor Keyes had derived.

Correct?

MR. KO: Object to the form.

- A. I employed a three-step process that you've summarized there pretty well.
- Q. In -- in the section on the impact of the sale and distribution of prescription opioids on property values, you offer the opinion that you had already calculated that prescription opioids were responsible for 7.2 percent of total crimes in the Cabell/Huntington community over the period of 2006 to 2018.

Did I get that right?

MR. PENDELL: Where's that in the

17 | report?

1

2

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

MR. KEYES: Paragraph 97.

MR. PENDELL: Thank you.

- A. That's the right number. I remember that number.
- Q. Okay. Tell me when you're at Paragraph 77
- 23 | -- 97.
- A. I'm there.

- Q. And do you see in Paragraph 97, you say,

 "The first causal link, between prescriptions and

 crime, has already been covered in Section III.D.

 Overall, I calculate that prescription opioids were

 responsible for 7.2% of total crimes in the

 Cabell/Huntington Community over the period of 2006

 to 2018."
 - A. Okay.

8

11

12

13

14

16

17

18

19

20

21

- Q. Did I read that correctly?
- 10 | A. I'm -- yes, you did.
 - Q. Okay. And then you make the assumption in your analysis that 7.2 percent of total crimes going forward will be prescription opioid-related.

 Correct?
- 15 A. That's correct, yes.
 - Q. What is the basis for that assumption, that 7.2 percent of total crimes going forward will be prescription opioid-related?
 - A. Well, it's the -- I had the very good basis of what the last 12 years have done.
 - Q. Okay. And --
- 22 A. So sorry to --
- Q. -- you're saying that the next 12 years
 will be the same as the last 12 years?

www.veritext.com 888-391-3376

- Well, I -- the -- it's -- I think it's a 1 2 very reasonable assumption that the percent that's 3 been characterized in this community over the past 12 years is a reasonable estimate of what it will 4 be going forward.
 - And why did you choose that 12-year period? Q.
 - The 2006 to 2018?
 - Yes. For this -- for this category of Ο. alleged economic harm or cost.
- 10 For the -- with respect to the property 11 values, you're asking?
- 12 Q. Yes.

5

6

8

9

13

18

19

20

21

2.4

- Well, that was using all the data I had. Α.
- 14 Okay. You then estimate that for every 1 15 percent increase in total crimes, there's a quarter 16 of a percentage point decrease in property values? 17 Did I get that right?
 - You did get that right. This was not an estimate I conducted; it was one that came from a paper in the literature.
 - 0. What paper was that?
- 22 I don't know if it's here or in the 23 appendix. Probably in the appendix.
 - Q. Do you recall the study offhand, without

Veritext Legal Solutions 888-391-3376 www.veritext.com

- 1 | looking at your report?
- A. I remember what the study did. It looked at -- the county-level study. And it -- multiple years, and looked at crime rates and how they correlated with property values.

But I --

7 | Q. You --

6

8

9

10

22

23

24

- A. -- my report to give you more than that.
- Q. It's referenced in Appendix C, Paragraph 37.
- 11 A. Okay.
- 12 Q. Are you there?
- 13 A. Yeah, I'm there.
- Q. Okay. Do you see in Paragraph 37, you refer to the Pope and Pope study?
- 16 A. Yes.
- 2. Do you rely on anything besides the Pope and Pope study for your decision to estimate that for every 1 percent increase in total crimes, there is a quarter of a percentage point decrease in property values?
 - A. Well, yes, I had a brief discussion here of other papers that fall in that literature that establish a causal connection between crime and

- 1 | property values.
 - Q. Okay.

4

5

6

8

10

11

12

13

14

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

2.4

- A. And --
- Q. Let's --
 - A. Just one more sentence. The Pope and Pope result was one that I could use in my analysis.
 - Q. Okay. You reference other studies. But do you reference any other studies that report or quantify the relationship between a percentage decline in crime and increased home values or a percentage increase in crime and a decrease in home value?
 - MR. PENDELL: Objection to form.
 - A. I'm just taking a quick look.
- 15 O. Please do.
 - A. I mean, the other studies that I referenced here don't build a percentage, as I recall them. I mean, I --
 - Q. What other studies are you referring to when you say you reference other studies?
 - A. Well, the ones in Paragraph 36. The effect of crime on property values. There's support for that in the economic literature.
 - Q. Okay. And do any of those studies that are

- referenced in Paragraph 36 quantify the link
 between an increase in crime and a decrease in home
 value or a decrease in crime and an increase in
 home value?
 - A. Well, they do, but they're specific to particular kinds of crime, and the -- you know, my task here was to not look at sex offender crimes, but it was to look at in general if there was a decrease in crime.
 - Q. And the Pope and Pope study looked at property values in certain zip codes in the 1990s, correct?
 - A. That's correct.
 - Q. Did you look at any study since the Pope and Pope study that looked at the relationship between crime rates and property values?
 - A. No. If I had, I would have put it down here.
 - Q. Okay. And your quantification here is reflecting the depressed property values in the Cabell County area that are the result of the expectation that crime will continue in the future at the same rate it's continued in the past.

24 | Correct?

1

4

5

6

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

A. No, I wouldn't say that.

1

4

5

6

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

2.4

- Q. What's wrong with that statement?
- A. What this -- it -- the statement is too strong in terms of what the assumption is. The assumption is that this is a percentage. So whatever expectation there is about crime which could be that it's trending down, for example there would be the -- you know, withdrawing the causal effect to prescription opioids would reduce that by 7.2 percent.

Is that clear?

- Q. Say that again? Please.
- A. The assumption is that the reduction in prescription-related crimes, if those were withdrawn, would reduce the level of crime by 7.2 percent.

It doesn't assume that the level of crime is constant from the past.

- Q. It assumes that the share of total crimes attributable to prescription opioids will be 7.2 percent in the future as it was between 2006 to 2018.
- A. That's the assumption that's necessary for me to make that calculation, yes.

- 1 Right. And you assume that because the share of total crimes attributable to prescription 3 opioids will continue to be 7.2 percent, it will continue to depress the market value of homes by a 4 quarter of a percentage point for each of those 7.2 6 percentage points.
 - Yeah, that's basically correct, yes.
 - Okay. And the reason the market values are Ο. depressed is because of the expectation that crime will continue at the same rate in the future.
 - See, that's the part that's not correct. Α.
 - 0. Why not?

2

5

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

2.4

Well, I explained that. The formula that I Α. use to predict the effect on property values is done in percents, so it's the percent reduction in crime is what needs to be -- the percent reduction due to prescription opioids, that I assume is the same going forward.

But once I know that percent, then I'm able to use the information from Pope and Pope to yield a percent decrease in property values that's caused by the prescription opioid property-related crime.

So I don't need to know people's

overall level of crime expectations; it's just this percent is all I need to be able to go forward.

2.4

You can just see the math there.

There's no overall level of expectation. It's just percent times percent times assessed value, bam.

Q. Do you do anything to adjust for the fact that the owners of the properties that are experiencing the depressed market value benefited from those lower property values when they purchased the property?

MR. PENDELL: Objection.

- A. Well, no, this, I think, would not be the kind of thing that would be a correct calculation here. If something falls in value, it falls in value. If you're the buyer of that, maybe you're a little better off; but if you're the seller, you're way worse off.
- Q. Okay. So is the answer that you did not do anything to adjust for the fact that the -- that some purchasers of the properties with what you say is a depressed market value benefited from that depressed market value when they bought the properties in the first place?

MR. PENDELL: Objection.

1 MR. KO: Asked and answered.

2

3

4

5

6

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

2.4

- A. This is a -- sorry. This is a wealth destruction. There are holdings in the -- if you want to say portfolios of local people, that are diminished by the expectation of crime. It's -- I don't know, it's a -- I don't even know how to say it beyond that. To construct this in some way to benefit people is, I think, really an odd aspect of economics -- would be an odd application of economics.
- Q. Well, it's not to say they benefit from it, but you're saying they're harmed by it without measuring the countervailing consideration.

MR. KO: Object to the form.

- A. No, here's the --
- Q. They may sell it for less, but they paid for less at the same time.

MR. PENDELL: Objection.

MR. KO: I don't know if there's a question pending, but object to the form.

THE DEPONENT: I have a statement to make even if there's not a question pending.

MR. KO: Go for it.

A. Okay, here's the thought experiment: There

is residential property owned by people in the end of 2019, and it is what it is, and one of the factors that influence the market value of those properties is the expectation of the, you know, neighborhood safety. Is my -- I'm going to go out and walk the dog at night without worrying; is my child not going to be exposed to, you know, needle exchange at a park down the street.

Those things will affect the property values. And at the end of 2019, they have a certain value. And now the thought experiment is: I'm going to wave an economic magic wand and take away 7.2 percent of the future crime that you, property owner, are worried about.

Bing, everyone's property value goes up. That's it.

- Q. Are you finished with your statement?
- A. Yes, I am.
- Q. Okay. Could you turn to Paragraph 33 of your report?
 - A. Okay.

Q. You say in your report, "From an economic standpoint, the costs due to the sales and distribution of prescription opioids include costs

for which prescription opioids are the proximate cause" "and those for which prescription opioids were the ultimate but not necessarily the proximate cause."

Do you see that?

- A. Well, yeah, I was in the wrong paragraph in the appendix. So it will just take me one second, but --
 - Q. Sure. It's page 17 of your report.
 - A. Okay, I see that.

1

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

- Q. Okay. So is it accurate to say that the costs that you've calculated due -- as being due to the sales and distribution of prescription opioids include some costs for which prescription opioids are the proximate cause and some costs for which prescription opioids were not necessarily the proximate cause?
 - A. I think that's fair to say.
- MR. KEYES: I don't have any further questions at this point.
- Do any other counsel have questions?

 MR. PENDELL: Plaintiffs counsel may.
- I would like to take a break, but I don't want to interfere with any of the other defendants that may

1 | have questions.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

15

16

17

20

21

22

23

2.4

I mean, Andy, if I knew you were going to be so short, we probably could have skipped lunch. But if I could have five minutes to talk to David for a moment, David Ko, I'd appreciate it.

MR. KEYES: Sure.

MR. KO: And Tom, go ahead and -- if you don't mind, Tom, why don't you just stay on the Zoom. And you don't have to mute if you mind staying for a moment. Okay?

VIDEO OPERATOR: Going off the record, the time is 1:25 p.m.

13 (A recess was taken after which the proceedings continued as follows:)

VIDEO OPERATOR: This begins Media
Unit 5 in the deposition of Tom McGuire. We're
back on the record. The time is 1:28 p.m.

18 EXAMINATION

19 BY MR. KO:

Q. Hey, Tom --

MR. KO: And just for the record, this is David Ko of Keller Rohrback on behalf of the plaintiffs.

Q. I just have a few follow-up questions

- regarding some of the stuff that Andy Keyes asked
 you this morning. And I'm going to call him "Andy"
 just to not confuse him with the expert, the
 plaintiff's expert, Kathy Keyes. (Zoom audio
 glitch)
 - A. Yeah, her beard looks very different than Andy's.
 - Q. So earlier today and this morning, I think Andy had asked you whether you had measured the benefits of treating patients with prescription opioids. Do you recall that?
 - A. I do, yes.

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

- Q. And in response to these questions, you generally responded that you were relying on the clinical inputs of other experts, and I believe in particular Doctor Waller and Doctor Lembke. Do you recall that?
 - A. I do, yes.
- Q. And for context and so the record is clear the sections of your report that you were discussing these questions that Andy asked was in the Morbidity/OUD or Opioid Use Disorder section of your report, correct?
 - A. That's correct.

- Q. And just so the record is clear once again, this is Section 3B of your report, I believe, right? And take your time to concretely confirm that.
 - A. That's correct.

2.4

- Q. Okay. Now, in that section and with respect to morbidity and setting aside your reliance on Doctors Lembke and Waller did you do any other economic analyses to quantify the potential benefit and costs related to prescription opioid use?
 - A. Yes, I did.
- Q. And it appears that you performed an economic analysis of the impact of prescription opioids on workplace productivity; is that correct?
 - A. That's generally correct, yes.
- Q. And can you describe to the Court briefly why you performed this analysis?
- A. Well, I was attempting to address the issue of what were the potential economic benefits to prescription opioids, and weigh those against costs in the same domain, the domain here being work force productivity.

And in order to do that, I examined

literature, which has a number of studies of the relationship between opioids and work, and came to a determination that on balance, on net, the negative effects on productivity outweigh the positive effects.

2.3

2.4

And you know, there are some studies that are very directly related to address that question.

Q. And is this analysis that you described a reasonable economic analysis to measure net benefits and costs?

MR. KEYES: Objection to form.

A. Well, it is. The -- again, what I did in this context was to review other papers that established the net -- the net costs or positive costs outweigh the benefits, but then going forward, I treated them as zero. I treated them as balancing out just exactly.

Which, you know, is a kind of measurement and it's a -- certainly a under -- an undercount or a conservative measurement of the net costs.

Q. And with respect to the studies that you just described, those studies, I presume, contain

data and evidence underlying those studies. Is that a fair assessment?

- A. Yeah, all of them are empirical studies, yes.
- Q. Okay. And so would you -- would it be fair to say that workplace productivity is a reasonable empirical proxy to measure benefits and costs for an economic analysis?

MR. KEYES: Objection to form.

- A. It's -- in this -- in this context, this is where -- you know, from an economic standpoint, this is how potential benefits might manifest themselves. So yes, I think it's a reasonable approach to -- you know, figuring your -- of benefits in relation to costs in economic terms.
- Q. And just a few more questions, Tom. Turn to Paragraph 63 of your report.
 - A. Okay.

Q. Okay. In that paragraph -- let's see. I believe you identify and indicate that the primary analysis you have performed regarding workplace productivity is complemented by the clinical opinions offered by other experts, including, as we discussed earlier today, Doctors Lembke and Doctor

- 1 | Waller. Is that correct?
 - A. Yes, I use the word "complemented" in the first sentence there.
 - Q. So would it also be fair to say that these clinical inputs that you discuss here supplement the primary economic analysis you performed regarding workplace productivity?
 - A. Yes, that's fair to say.
 - Q. Okay.

4

5

6

8

- MR. KO: That's all I have. Thank
 11 you, Tom.
- MR. KEYES: Does anyone else have any questions for Professor McGuire?
- MR. PENDELL: I just want to note that
 we'll read and sign. I want to make sure that I
 don't forget to say that.
- MR. KEYES: Professor McGuire, thank you for your time.
- MR. KO: Thanks everyone.
- THE DEPONENT: Thank you.
- VIDEO OPERATOR: We are off the record at 1:34 p.m., and this concludes today's testimony given by Tom McGuire. The total number of media
- 24 units used was five and will be retained by

		Page 152
1	Veritext.	
2		(Having indicated he would like to
3		read his deposition before filing,
4		further this deponent saith not.)
5		
6		000
7		
8		
9		
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
2 4		

STATE OF WEST VIRGINIA, COUNTY OF JACKSON, to wit;

I, Teresa S. Evans, a Notary Public within and for the County and State aforesaid, duly commissioned and qualified, do hereby certify that the foregoing deposition of THOMAS McGUIRE was duly taken by me and before me at the time and place and for the purpose specified in the caption hereof, the said witness having been by me first duly sworn.

I do further certify that the said deposition was correctly taken by me in shorthand notes, and that the same were accurately written out in full and reduced to typewriting and that the witness did request to read his transcript.

I further certify that I am neither attorney or counsel for, nor related to or employed by, any of the parties to the action in which this deposition is taken, and further that I am not a relative or employee of any attorney or counsel employed by the parties or financially interested in the action and that the attached transcript meets the requirements set forth within article twenty-seven, chapter forty-seven of the West Virginia Code.

My commission expires October 25, 2020. Given under my hand this 11th day of September,

Teresa S. Evans

RMR, CRR, RPR, WV-CCR

1

STATE OF WEST VIRGINIA

of my ability.

2

COUNTY OF KANAWHA, to wit;

3

I, Teresa Evans, owner of Realtime Reporters,

LLC, do hereby certify that the attached deposition

transcript of THOMAS McGUIRE meets the requirements

set forth within article twenty-seven, chapter

forty-seven of the West Virginia Code to the best

9

Given under my hand this 11th day of September, 2020.

12

11

13

1415

16

17

1819

20

212223

24

GIASH HINGER WIN Han

Registered Professional Reporter/Certified Realtime Reporter

	Page 155
1	Veritext Legal Solutions
	1100 Superior Ave
2	Suite 1820
	Cleveland, Ohio 44114
3	Phone: 216-523-1313
4	
	September 14, 2020
5	
	To: Michael Pendell, Esquire
6	
	Case Name: City of Huntington v. Amerisourcebergen Drug Corporation
7	
	Veritext Reference Number: 4245440
8	
	Witness: Thomas McGuire Deposition Date: 9/9/2020
9	
10	Dear Sir/Madam:
11	
	Enclosed please find a deposition transcript. Please have the witness
12	
	review the transcript and note any changes or corrections on the
13	
	included errata sheet, indicating the page, line number, change, and
14	
	the reason for the change. Have the witness' signature notarized and
15	
	forward the completed page(s) back to us at the Production address
16	shown
17	above, or email to production-midwest@veritext.com.
18	
	If the errata is not returned within thirty days of your receipt of
19	
	this letter, the reading and signing will be deemed waived.
20	
21	Sincerely,
22	Production Department
23	
24	NO NOTARY REQUIRED IN CA

www.veritext.com 888-391-3376

Veritext Legal Solutions

www.veritext.com 888-391-3376

	E.	RRATA SHEET	
7	JERITEXT L	EGAL SOLUTIONS	S MIDWEST
	ASSIGN	MENT NO: 4245	440
PAGE/LINE	(S) /	CHANGE	/REASON
Date		Thomas Mc	Guire
SUBSCRIBEI	O AND SWOR	N TO BEFORE MI	E THIS
			
	Notary		
	1	-	

www.veritext.com 888-391-3376

[& - 9/9/2020] Page 1

&	1990s 139:11	27:14,15 37:23	4245440 155:7
& 2:12,14 6:12	1:25 146:12	38:4 42:17 116:17	156:2 157:2 158:2
0	1:28 146:17	153:17,18 154:11	44114 155:2
	1:34 151:22	155:4	48 84:22
043 120:7	2	216-523-1313	4th 23:19 25:3,13
053 120:6	2 14:3 79:20,24	155:3	28:10,10
1	80:18 115:5,5	22 83:4	5
1 5:13 136:14	20 20:1,5 79:21	23 130:1,8	5 12:13 14:8
137:19	156:16 157:22	24 131:19	146:16
100 42:23 82:2	158:22	24th 9:3 116:17	50 90:11,18,19
90:10 101:16,19	20,000 22:3,5	123:13	92:11 94:11
103:21 129:8	20005 2:13	25 153:17	100:18
103 110:16	2006 44:9 46:21	25,000 22:3,5	53 86:24
10538 153:19	47:5,22 48:12,21	25323 2:16	56 60:20 61:4,10
154:16	49:7,18 50:9 51:6	28 2:6	5th 25:14 28:10
10:28 62:21	54:17 56:1 104:21	29464 2:6	6
10:38 63:1	105:4 114:14	2:00 24:15	6 44:6,13
10th 117:21,24	134:13 135:6	3	63 72:3 73:9
122:14	136:7 140:21	3 17:12 33:9 40:1	150:17
11 44:13	2007 104:21 105:4	63:2 115:5	64 72:4,7 73:24
1100 155:1	2008 104:21 105:5	3100 2:20	65 74:8
11th 153:17	2009 104:21 105:5	31st 27:14,15	67 97:14,16
154:10	2010 120:5	32 61:11	,
12 135:20,23,24	2011 115:7,16	3200 2:8	7
136:4,6	20118 121:9	33 144:19	7.2 134:12 135:5
1201 2:8	2013 104:21 105:5	36 138:21 139:1	135:12,17 140:10
12:04 123:19	120:14 121:9	37 137:10,14	140:15,20 141:3,5
12:56 124:1	2015 104:21 105:5	38 78:10	144:13
14 155:4	2017 80:12	3:00 24:16	707 2:15
146 4:4	2018 44:9 46:21	3:17-01362 1:7	72 91:2 94:24
17 145:9	47:5,22 48:13,21	5:20	725 2:12
1717 2:20	49:8,18 50:9 51:6	3:17-01665 1:13	77 134:22
176 110:5	54:17 56:1 82:2	5:20	78 124:14
18 23:20 24:5,22	120:14 134:14	3b 148:2	8
38:2,5 39:3,10,20	135:7 136:7	3rd 8:21 28:10	8 4:3
40:12 42:19	140:22	35:8,17	850.00 19:14
180 19:23 20:4	2019 17:24 144:2	4	9
1820 155:2	144:10	4 85:6 115:5	9 114:24 115:3,19
183 105:2 110:5,5 19103 2:21	2020 1:22 5:4 8:21	123:24 130:2,8	9/9/2020 155:8
17105 4.21	9:3 19:21,21 20:3		156:3 157:3
	23:19 25:4 26:6,7		130.3 137.3

[901 - andy's] Page 2

901 2:15	accurately 153:9	administration	aid 43:11
97 82:8 134:18,23	acknowledge	103:11,13,24	al 1:8,14 5:17
135:1	88:14 96:21 97:7	104:11,16,19	156:3 157:3
97.5 114:13	98:2 156:11	105:8 106:7,9,16	alexander 40:5,8
98101 2:9	157:16	106:18 107:6	40:11,15
9:04 5:3	acknowledging	109:23	alleged 136:9
9:14 14:1	98:5	adrian 15:6,7 16:3	allocate 48:8
9:21 14:4	act 156:14 157:20	20:22 28:3 29:13	allow 64:11,13
9th 1:21 5:3	action 1:6,13,20	29:21 30:1 119:24	88:7
a	5:19 6:3 153:12	120:1,21,23	allowed 23:23
a.m. 5:3 14:1,4	153:14	121:17,18,22	allows 100:7
62:21 63:1	activities 63:20	128:9,10	alternatives 74:11
abdc 6:24	actors 47:23 48:13	affect 144:9	75:8
ability 63:19 154:8	48:19 54:19	affiliations 6:7	alyssa 2:19
able 30:20 41:18	actual 122:4,5	affixed 156:15	amazingly 122:1
49:22 50:4 56:10	actuaries 87:10	157:21	amerisourceberg
96:1 104:20 109:7	acute 61:21 62:5,9	aforesaid 153:4	1:7,14 2:17 5:17
119:7 126:11	67:13,21 68:4,10	afternoon 2:19	43:9 155:6 156:3
141:20 142:2	68:17,24 73:1	24:12 25:16	157:3
abstinence 88:9,14	74:14,18 75:4	agencies 103:16	amount 21:7,21
90:23	adam 3:3 5:22	104:1 107:4	23:4 50:11,20,21
abstract 26:18	added 126:7	125:14,21 126:1,2	52:7 53:3,4,23
abuse 102:1 106:1	addicted 93:11,15	126:3,4,11 128:6	analogous 115:22
106:10,22 107:11	93:17,21	128:11,15 129:7	analyses 148:9
107:16 108:3,8,14	addiction 92:23	130:12	analysis 16:10
108:20,24 109:2	99:5,14 100:1	agency 104:7	31:9,11 32:8,11
109:10,12 110:24	addictive 92:5	106:23 107:2,4	33:3,6 103:9
112:12,23 113:4,9	addition 20:11	aggregate 126:7	109:20 124:12
113:21 114:5	address 65:7,13	aggregation	135:12 138:6
abusing 109:13	66:18,23 98:20	132:16	148:14,18 149:9
acceptable 57:19	115:23 148:19	ago 31:22 51:23	149:10 150:8,21
57:24 59:24 63:6	149:7 155:15	129:3	151:6
account 50:14	addressed 52:15	agree 5:11 46:24	analysts 15:8,14
53:8 68:6 86:17	101:8	60:8 61:20 62:3,9	16:4 20:23
88:2 99:19,22	addresses 44:7	64:17	andrew 2:11 6:11
accounting 19:22	70:22	agreed 23:3	andy 12:20 13:1
22:15,22	addressing 71:19	ahead 6:14,17 7:6	23:22 60:22
accounts 85:7,18	adjust 130:10	18:15 33:21 40:22	122:19 146:2
accurate 19:7,15	142:6,19	43:15 48:6 58:16	147:1,2,9,21
46:8 48:2 50:6	administer 6:2	146:7	andy's 147:7
91:6 117:9 145:11			
71.0 11/.7 1 15.11			

anne 2:4 7:13	applying 112:19	76:23 77:14 89:1	14:23 16:14 20:13
answer 11:12	apportion 55:19	119:21 143:1	20:14 21:9 22:12
18:22 22:2 40:22	56:9	147:1,9,21	assume 85:11
47:9 49:12,14	apportionment	asking 36:8 85:11	90:11 94:24 95:1
51:23 53:16 55:7	55:22	85:14 86:4 97:5	111:18,22 140:17
56:7 63:18 67:1	appreciate 146:5	102:24 115:13	141:1,17
71:4,7,8 89:22	approach 31:6,8	125:2 136:11	assumed 92:10
94:14 107:20	84:19 86:10	aspect 143:8	111:22
108:12,23 109:7	150:14	assess 69:20 79:17	assumes 140:19
131:11 142:18	approached 11:3	109:1	assumption 74:20
answered 66:12	approaches	assessed 142:5	90:21 94:12 96:5
69:23 76:24 143:1	124:19	assessing 54:22	96:9,20 100:17,18
answering 31:20	approaching	112:6	106:20 135:11,16
45:22	26:10	assessment 56:12	136:2 140:4,5,13
answers 87:23	appropriate 50:20	56:21 57:16 58:3	140:23
antenatal 97:18	51:17 52:19 87:22	58:10,20 109:1	attached 153:14
98:3	appropriately	150:2	154:4 157:7
anticipate 20:4	64:24 65:6,13,17	assign 106:3,10,15	attachment 115:1
anxiety 64:3,8	appropriateness	108:2,8	attempt 56:9 57:3
69:8	50:24 52:4	assigned 106:17	66:4,9,22 67:6,11
anyway 56:7	arch 2:20	106:23 108:24	67:19 68:1,2,8,13
appear 156:11	area 31:24 61:24	109:10	68:15,20,22 69:6
157:15	62:8 63:16 64:5	assignment 11:23	69:11,13,17,19
appearance 6:10	64:10,15 65:4,16	12:9,12 18:4	70:2,7 89:18
appearances 2:1	65:21 67:23 68:12	26:11 48:7 50:13	113:20
3:1 6:6 7:16	79:17 83:24 88:24	52:4 54:24 55:19	attempting 41:23
appearing 2:2,10	139:21	56:8 57:22 58:19	45:22 50:16 77:22
2:17	areas 124:20	59:18 83:2 106:13	101:22 148:19
appears 117:2	argue 115:10	108:1 156:2 157:2	attending 6:6
148:13	arguing 115:13	158:2	attorney 6:10
appended 157:11	arriving 22:4	assigns 107:16	153:12,13
157:18	article 153:15	assistance 12:19	attributable 54:19
appendix 23:9,20	154:6	14:13	84:24 86:21 89:12
24:5,22 33:9 38:5	articulate 53:10	assisted 12:14	90:9 92:15 93:23
39:20 40:1 42:18	53:22	14:9,17,23 15:2	94:2 95:15,16
87:2 130:2,6	aside 42:14 148:7	associated 47:11	113:23 114:8,15
136:23,23 137:9	asked 10:14,16	55:10 60:3,15	124:5,8,24 126:22
145:7	36:4,15 42:12	61:15 74:10 83:10	127:6,15,16,17,18
application 143:9	54:4,5,8 59:15	90:17 97:2 101:12	129:14,19 130:13
applied 110:23	66:12,14 67:18	associates 11:14	130:15,22 131:9
	69:23 71:2 75:24	12:15,18 14:10,13	133:7,12 140:20
		<u> </u>	

	T		
141:2	based 20:13 21:9	69:19 70:3 143:8	boulevard 2:6
attribute 113:6	22:7,13 27:1 31:1	143:11 148:10	bound 111:8 112:3
132:4	33:6 49:1 51:17	benefited 142:8,21	113:16 131:4,14
attributes 84:8	59:3 74:20,23	benefits 64:17	breaching 55:5
audio 5:9,10 7:20	81:19 91:8 105:21	71:7,9,12 72:2,5	bread 95:21,22
11:2 13:21 28:7	109:1,8,18 121:23	72:13,20,24 73:16	break 60:23 62:15
39:11 111:7 147:4	125:16 127:24	73:18 74:4 75:2,8	145:23
august 8:21 9:3	basic 116:14	75:24 76:7,12,22	breese 2:18 6:23
19:21 20:3,5 35:8	basically 83:12	77:3,10,21 78:1,4	6:23
35:17 116:16	111:3 141:7	78:7 147:10	bridgeside 2:6
117:21,24 122:14	basis 30:20 49:3	148:20 149:11,16	brief 137:22
123:13	59:17 90:15 96:5	150:7,12,15	briefly 148:17
author 87:11	96:9,17 112:22	best 40:23 73:10	bright 7:7
authorize 157:11	135:16,19	88:3 90:2 103:1	bring 24:7 32:12
authorized 6:2	bear 11:24	154:7	broadly 87:21
availability 103:6	beard 147:6	better 13:7,17	101:14
available 73:10	began 10:21 19:20	51:14 71:3 142:16	build 138:17
ave 155:1	beginning 6:10	beyond 120:20	burnett 2:4 7:10
avenue 2:8	13:3,5,13 26:1,5	143:7	7:10
aware 89:1 100:13	72:3 73:9 101:19	big 25:17 82:14	butter 95:21,22
118:16 131:12	begins 14:2 63:1	112:9	buyer 142:15
b	123:23 124:14	billed 16:19	buying 45:17
b 23:9,20 24:5,22	146:15	billings 20:13,18	buys 44:22
33:9 38:2,5 39:3	behalf 6:12,19,24	20:22 21:10 23:1	c
39:10,20 40:1,12	7:9,11 146:22	bing 144:15	c 5:1 7:23 87:2
42:19	believe 9:4,13 11:7	birth 88:19 92:15	115:1 130:2,6
babies 89:6 94:12	14:16 20:23 33:24	94:2 96:23 97:8	137:9
96:10 99:11,22	35:3,21 38:24	97:22 98:4,12,21	ca 155:24
baby 90:8 100:8	39:21 40:10,17	99:12,22	cabell 1:11 5:16
101:3	43:19,21,22 44:1,2	births 88:23 89:8	8:17 9:15 12:4
back 10:20 14:3	45:13 49:5 60:7	89:11 90:12 92:9	23:11 48:23 49:7
62:24 73:2 98:15	73:8 90:15 103:16	92:11 95:2,15	49:11,17,24 51:5
104:4 107:9	107:22 114:6	96:6	54:17 56:1 80:9
114:20 115:1	128:9 129:22	bit 24:17 107:19	83:15,22 84:4,7,11
124:1 132:15	147:15 148:2	111:4 119:13	88:4,4,23 89:8,11
133:2 146:17	150:20	122:9	90:6,12 91:15,18
155:15	believed 106:22	born 94:12 96:10	92:9 94:17 102:3
balance 149:3	benefit 59:22 63:5	96:10 99:11,22	102:8,9,11,15,16
balancing 149:18	65:24 66:4,10,22	100:8	102:19 103:3
bam 142:5	67:6,11,20 68:2,8	bought 142:22	110:9,12,21 111:2
N. 112.5	68:15,22 69:6,13		i i
	00.13,22 07.0,13		111:6,10,24

[cabell - child] Page 5

112:13 113:7,17	cancer 60:15	95:5,12 98:11,21	certification 156:1
113:22 114:6	61:16 65:8,14	99:10,21 100:6,19	157:1
115:7 124:7,23	66:19,24	114:14 117:14	certified 154:17
125:12 126:18	captain 25:8	126:6	certify 153:5,8,11
128:4 129:5,7	caption 153:6	caseworker	154:4
131:5,7,14 132:1,7	cardinal 2:10 6:12	107:20,22,24	chafin 25:9
132:14,18,20	6:19 43:8	108:2,6	chain 43:13
134:13 135:6	care 60:15 61:16	categories 50:16	change 13:2 26:10
139:21	64:18 65:1 67:7	126:9,24 129:12	26:12 31:6,8
caesarean 67:13	83:9 87:15	categorization	117:15 119:1,3
67:22	carefully 34:9	55:10	155:13,14 157:8
cal 40:10	caregiver 107:13	category 35:13	158:3
calculate 83:7	108:15 109:2	47:15 50:5 56:9	changed 13:4
135:4	caregivers 109:13	121:6 128:21	119:5 122:8
calculated 20:16	carey 2:14 6:21,21	129:1,13,17,19	changes 117:4,7
21:2 95:7 110:20	case 8:9,12,15,19	130:15,22 131:9	117:10,15,17
133:13 134:11	9:11,23 10:12,19	133:17,19 136:8	118:7 119:1,20
145:12	11:4,22 16:24	causal 135:2	122:8 123:1
calculation 20:21	17:1,6,8,11,14,18	137:24 140:9	155:12 156:7
76:6 140:24	17:21 18:4,9,10,10	cause 26:9,14 31:6	157:7,9
142:13	18:11,13 19:11,11	91:21 100:16	chapter 153:15
calculations 10:4	19:11,18 22:8	116:2 145:2,4,15	154:6
10:5 27:1 32:9	25:23 31:19 35:23	145:17	characterized
33:4,7 41:3 55:2	40:20 43:4,20	caused 88:15	136:3
82:2 90:11 114:13	44:2,3 47:23 48:9	96:21 97:7 108:14	charge 16:17
121:8	48:14 49:2,15	141:22	charleston 2:16
caleb 40:5,8,10,15	53:20 55:4,16	causes 96:18	6:20
call 12:4 43:6 51:4	56:11,23 57:7	111:17	chase 2:15
105:20 112:2	58:2,5,12 59:2,5	ccr 153:20	check 9:18 81:22
118:3 120:3 127:1	60:8 77:19 79:5	cell 5:7	81:23 132:15
147:2	81:18 105:18	cellular 5:6	checked 19:19
called 7:24	107:17 108:3,9	center 129:21	checking 105:18
calls 23:10,15 25:1	109:1,10 124:22	130:17	chemicals 88:16
27:13,18,21 28:3	127:9 155:6 156:3	certain 50:11	91:21
29:8,20,22 30:2	157:3	104:17 105:10	chief 25:7
31:5 32:13 38:2,5	cases 18:23 19:8	128:6 139:11	child 101:10,23,24
39:2 40:6,7,11,14	22:6,9,11 31:13	144:11	103:16 104:1,6
42:18	32:18,19 82:20	certainly 38:1	105:24 106:19,23
canal 68:4	83:1,8,14,21 84:7	57:2 110:4 149:20	107:4 111:14,17
canals 68:7	84:11,23 91:12,19	certificate 157:11	111:19 114:14
	92:15 93:23 94:1		116:5 144:7

child's 109:12,13	67:3,9,23 68:5,13	134:13 135:6	confident 113:16
children 102:4,12	68:19 69:4,10,16	136:3	confidently 95:23
102:19 103:3,11	70:6,10,16,20,23	companies 44:1	113:19
103:14,24 104:12	70:24 73:21 76:3	company 11:9,13	confirm 110:15
104:17,19 105:9	77:15 78:4,7,7	comparing 22:8	129:23 148:3
106:7,9,16 107:6	147:15 150:22	110:11	confirmed 32:2
109:24 110:12,13	151:5	compass 14:16,19	confuse 147:3
110:21,22 112:5,7	clinicians 67:24	compensation	conn 2:19
115:20 116:13	75:21,23 76:18	20:12,16 21:7	connection 137:24
choices 133:1	78:3	22:12 23:5	connolly 2:12 6:12
choose 136:6	close 51:8	complemented	conservative
chose 87:24	closed 58:23	150:22 151:2	94:11 100:18
chronic 72:12,19	closer 24:7	complete 33:22	111:5 149:21
73:1	cloud 29:5	completed 18:16	conservatively
chunk 82:14	coast 7:8	155:15	77:7
circumstances	code 153:16 154:7	component 57:23	consider 12:2 40:6
74:22	codes 139:11	composition 80:14	50:23 78:4
citation 117:7	collected 20:13	comprise 132:5	consideration
citations 123:2	21:9	compute 59:19	143:13
cite 86:21 87:4	collects 125:18	computed 96:16	considered 47:10
cited 87:2 110:2	come 36:1 75:6	computer 28:15	57:6 71:1 98:18
city 1:4 5:15 8:16	78:5 87:23 95:9	28:16,19 30:9	consistent 75:14
155:6 156:3 157:3	112:7 116:13	computing 112:4	constant 140:18
civil 1:6,13,20	132:1	concerned 32:1	constitute 54:2,10
5:19 156:5 157:5	comes 86:7 93:10	concluded 109:11	constitutes 53:24
claim 31:1	118:4	concludes 151:22	construct 143:7
clarification 19:5	comfortable	conclusion 12:6	consult 81:14
classification	131:13	75:6,11	consumer 45:7
128:19	coming 98:15	concrete 31:24	consumers 46:18
classified 86:8	115:12	concretely 148:3	contact 15:5
clear 47:24 57:12	commission 1:11	condition 100:23	contain 149:24
140:11 147:20	5:16 153:17	conditional 70:17	contd 3:1
148:1	156:19 157:25	conduct 15:8	context 52:13 67:8
cleveland 155:2	158:25	54:19 65:23 66:2	71:21 93:9 107:14
cliff 2:18 6:23	commissioned	66:17,20	147:19 149:14
clinical 50:24 52:3	153:5	conducted 5:21	150:10
52:13,14,21 53:1,7	common 44:17	136:19	continue 5:10
53:7,18,19 56:24	community 9:16	confer 73:13	139:22 141:3,4,10
57:5,6,15,21,23	12:4 26:21 31:13	conferencing 5:22	continued 7:21
58:1 59:24 63:6	80:9,9 124:7,23	confidence 113:8	13:23 62:23
63:17 66:7,14	125:13,22 126:19		123:21 139:23

[continued - data] Page 7

146:14	139:13,24 141:7	153:12,13	covered 16:1,6
contrast 74:8	141:11 142:13	count 88:24 96:2	42:2 48:20 135:3
contribution	147:23,24 148:5	98:21 99:21 113:6	craig 36:16,19,22
48:18	148:15,16 151:1	124:21 125:11	create 116:5
controlled 64:22	corrected 119:10	127:13,14	crime 124:4
controls 87:22	119:18 121:14,23	countervailing	127:13 135:3
conversation	123:6	143:13	137:4,24 138:10
40:18 43:1	corrections 9:6	counting 112:5	138:11,22 139:2,3
conversations 5:6	119:20 120:3,12	country 131:6	139:6,9,16,22
30:16 42:10	121:2 123:2,2	counts 83:18	140:6,15,18 141:9
conveyed 81:12	155:12 157:17	95:20 105:6,11	141:16,23 142:1
coordinated 16:4	correctly 42:15	county 1:11 5:16	143:5 144:13
copy 116:19	135:9 153:9	8:17 12:5 16:23	crimes 124:7,22
corporation 1:8	correlated 137:5	16:24 17:5,6,15	125:12,22 126:9
1:14 5:17 155:6	cost 51:9,9 73:16	18:9 19:10,10	126:18,21,23,24
156:3 157:3	75:9 77:3,5,9,17	23:11 48:23 49:7	127:2,3,3,4,10,21
correct 8:9 9:4,7	112:5,6 125:1	49:11,17,24 51:6	127:22 128:16,18
19:16 20:6 21:19	136:9	54:17 56:1 83:22	128:20,21,22
22:21 28:12 29:11	costly 73:15 90:6	84:4,7,11 88:4,4	129:1,7,11,13,19
29:12 35:9 41:8	costs 12:3 47:11	88:23 89:8,11	130:11,12,14,21
46:22 47:5 54:20	48:2,8 50:14	90:6,13 91:15,18	131:9,16 133:4,6
54:21 57:11 72:16	51:12,14 52:1,6	92:9 94:17 102:4	133:17,18,23,24
72:20,21 77:11,13	54:15,23 55:2,9,13	102:5,11,13,19	134:12 135:5,12
78:15 79:21,22	55:23 59:9,19	103:3 110:9,12,21	135:17 136:15
81:7 83:11,12	70:22 71:5,6,8,11	111:2,10 112:13	137:19 139:7
84:9,14 85:13	71:24 72:23 75:1	113:7,17,22 114:6	140:14,19 141:2
86:22 87:1 88:20	76:1,4,12,13 77:10	115:8 128:4 129:5	crisis 111:13,17
89:9 90:13,24	77:18,20,24 78:5,7	129:7 131:8	criteria 59:24 63:7
91:13,14 92:12,13	79:17 82:22 83:8	132:14,18 137:3	108:7
92:18 94:23 95:4	83:10 86:20 87:15	139:21 153:2,4	critical 62:4
95:17 98:8 101:13	101:12 124:20	154:2 156:10	criticism 81:11
101:14 104:17,18	144:23,24 145:12	157:15	crr 153:20
104:22 105:6,7,13	145:14,15 148:10	couple 12:10	cut 33:20
106:1,2 110:9,10	148:21 149:11,15	16:11	cuyahoga 16:23
111:3 112:18,21	149:16,22 150:7	course 18:10	17:6 18:9 19:10
114:2 116:17	150:15	19:24 37:23 60:5	cvs 43:11
117:8 121:1,5,20	counsel 5:14 6:5	65:20	d
125:4 128:7	6:20 11:10 25:6	court 1:1 5:18,24	d 2:4 5:1
129:16,22 131:18	26:9 27:13 29:2,9	7:16 17:15 148:17	data 31:14 41:23
133:14,15 134:4	31:11,16 85:23	156:7	86:5,6,10 88:6
135:14,15 139:12	124:15 145:21,22		102:3,8,11,15,16
			102.5,0,11,15,10

[data - disorder] Page 8

102:18 103:3,6,9	decline 138:10	156:1,3 157:1,3	44:24 45:1,5,14
103:12,14 104:1,6	decrease 64:2,7	depositions 35:14	48:9,18 49:12
104:12,16,20	69:7 136:16	depress 141:4	56:18 58:17 77:13
105:9,21,23 106:5	137:20 138:11	depressed 139:20	86:7 88:5 97:3
106:6,12,18,21	139:2,3,9 141:21	141:9 142:8,21,22	126:24 147:6
107:5,12 108:1	deed 156:14	derive 127:14	differentiate 59:8
109:9 113:4	157:20	derived 22:16	differently 26:15
125:24 126:11	deemed 155:19	94:21 111:7 134:3	difficult 41:9
127:24 128:3,5,14	defendant 2:10,17	describe 18:3 87:9	diminished 143:5
128:21,23 129:4,5	5:15	148:17	dinner 24:13
130:11 131:8,12	defendants 1:9,15	described 25:18	direct 80:15 104:8
131:13 132:1,7,22	1:19 6:15 7:24	90:15 129:2 149:9	directed 71:3
132:23 133:20	43:4,19,21 44:1,3	149:24	direction 12:16
136:13 150:1	47:23 48:13 49:2	describes 132:10	14:11 26:10,13
date 122:17 155:8	49:15 55:4,15,20	destruction 143:3	29:16
156:3,9,19 157:3	55:20 56:3,14,23	detail 12:10	directly 64:23
157:13,25 158:20	57:18 58:5,12,22	108:17,22 109:7	82:14 83:19 84:2
158:25	59:5 145:24	detailed 107:20	84:8,12 86:8
dated 8:21	definitely 122:23	108:11	92:23 93:3,7
dates 25:15	definition 45:23	details 22:21	95:10 116:3
davenport 87:11	101:21	41:20 42:7 102:23	119:22 126:4,5,16
88:1	definitive 74:9	103:5	128:6 129:6 149:7
david 2:4,7 7:8,10	degree 97:1	determination	disclosed 18:21,24
146:5,5,22	128:18	66:8,16 67:5,10	discretionary 23:5
davies 25:9	delay 14:6	68:1,14,21 69:5,12	23:7
day 1:21 24:12,14	department	69:18 70:8 78:6	discuss 41:2,10
35:17 153:17	103:10 104:10	108:6 149:3	88:9 151:5
154:10 156:16	129:20 130:16	determinations	discussed 34:20
157:22 158:22	155:22	53:21	41:16 94:18
days 24:11 25:13	deponent 13:14,18	determine 57:3	150:24
25:16 122:2	19:3 143:21	77:9,10 92:14	discussing 95:20
155:18	151:20 152:4	112:14 131:8	96:2 116:8 147:21
dc 2:13	deposed 17:21	132:7 133:6,18,22	discussion 7:18
dealt 56:8 58:1	18:1,2	determined	13:21 89:16 90:4
98:18	deposition 1:19	133:24	137:22
dear 155:10	5:9,14,21 14:3	determining 93:22	disease 85:18 94:9
deaths 78:14,23	33:13,16,18,22	102:24	95:20 96:1,18,19
79:3,12 82:3,9,17	34:7,13,16,19 63:2	diagnosed 88:18	116:2,6
deciding 108:7	123:24 146:16	difference 73:22	disorder 94:10
decision 137:18	152:3 153:5,9,13	different 14:18	100:19,21 101:2
	154:4 155:8,11	15:8,10 16:4,5	116:3 147:22
1	1		

Veritext Legal Solutions 888-391-3376

			I
dispensed 58:12	74:13,24 75:1,11	126:22 127:4,5,10	149:10 150:8,11
distinction 101:5	75:19,19 76:9,9,15	127:15,16 129:9	150:15 151:6
distributed 47:16	76:15,19,20 78:14	129:14,20 130:15	economics 143:9
55:4 56:22 57:17	78:22 117:15	130:22 131:10	143:10
58:4,11,21	147:16,16 150:24	due 55:14 78:15	economist 43:10
distributing 49:4	doctors 77:23	78:17,18,23 79:3	60:6 77:6 95:23
50:10	148:8 150:24	79:12 82:3,3,9,9	99:20
distribution 43:13	dog 144:6	82:14,15 83:8,14	edge 98:17
44:8,16,18,24 45:2	doing 26:15,24	83:22 84:12,13,23	editorialize 111:4
45:10,14,23 46:6,7	41:5 49:3 73:4	86:9 87:15 90:13	effect 138:21
46:14,20 47:2,12	81:23	90:23 91:19 92:11	140:9 141:14
47:21 48:12 50:8	dollars 125:1	92:16,19,23,23,24	effective 26:23
50:18,20,21 51:5	domain 148:22,22	92:24 93:2,3,4,7	61:21 74:12
51:10,18,19 52:1,9	donahoe 15:13	93:13,17,18,24	effects 149:4,5
53:3,5,11,23 54:1	16:8	94:10,12,15,17	effort 22:8
54:9,16,23 55:8,11	doubt 100:16	95:2,3,5,12 96:6,7	either 22:24 28:9
55:14,24 56:2,13	doubtful 132:20	96:13 97:18 98:3	28:24 56:20 92:23
58:23 59:4,10,11	douglas 2:14 6:21	100:6,19 101:3	116:3
78:19,21,24 79:4	dr 25:7,8,9	115:24 116:4	elaborating 31:21
79:13 124:8 133:8	draw 34:11	117:15 124:5	eliminate 55:1
133:13 134:2,9	drawing 100:20	127:4,10 129:8	email 155:17
144:24 145:13	drug 1:7,14 5:17	134:1 141:17	emphasis 56:17
distributions 47:4	43:12 106:1,3,10	144:23 145:12,12	empirical 150:3,7
52:8	106:22 107:11,16	duly 8:1 153:4,5,7	employed 134:6
distributors 43:6	108:3,8,14,20,24	duty 55:5	153:12,14
48:22 49:6,12,19	109:2,9,12 110:8	e	employee 153:13
50:2	110:24 112:12,15	e 5:1,1 7:23	encapsulation
district 1:1,1 5:18	112:20,23 113:3,4	earlier 35:18 89:1	45:18
5:19	113:9,21,22 114:5	96:16 115:23	enclosed 155:11
diversion 59:2	114:7 126:24	147:8 150:24	ended 24:15
diverted 58:22	127:3,4,21 128:16	early 7:7	enforcement
divided 54:12	128:17,21,22	early 7.7	125:13,21 126:10
dividing 52:18,22	129:7,11,21	east 2:15 economic 31:9,11	128:6,11,15 129:6
53:2,10,22	130:17 131:16,24	44:7 48:10 50:7,9	130:12
doc 38:6	132:3,5,8,14 133:4	50:17 51:4,13,17	engaged 10:18
doctor 25:9 37:1,5	133:19,22 155:6	52:6 54:14,15	11:21
37:8,10,13,16	156:3 157:3	·	engagement 10:22
38:12,15,18,20	drugs 46:1 61:20	55:2,9,13,23 59:9 59:19 101:9,23	14:14,17,20,23
39:13,17,21 41:1	62:3 91:24 92:3,5	124:4 136:9	15:19 16:14 22:14
42:11,17 71:1,10	107:15 109:14		22:20
71:14,24 72:9,22	113:14 116:9	138:23 144:12,22	
, ,		148:9,14,20	

engagements 19:1	105:5 112:1 113:3	exchange 144:8	66:7 67:9 70:11
enter 26:3	113:16,20 124:22	exclude 47:3,6	70:16,20 89:16,21
entered 120:10	125:9 129:13	excluded 47:16	147:15 150:23
157:9	130:12 131:17	excluding 47:13	expiration 156:19
entering 26:2	133:3 136:4,14,19	excuse 103:20	157:25 158:25
entire 156:5 157:5	137:18	executed 157:10	expires 153:17
entirety 34:3,5	estimated 89:8	execution 156:14	explain 41:13
35:11,12	94:16 96:19	157:19	78:13 83:7
entities 43:19	105:11,23 110:7	expect 22:9	explained 120:21
entitled 1:20	124:6 131:15	expectation 21:20	141:13
entry 25:3 120:7	estimates 79:7	139:22 140:6	explains 22:15
epidemiologic	89:6	141:9 142:4 143:5	85:15,20 131:23
86:5	et 1:8,14 5:17	144:4	explanation 86:13
epidemiologist	156:3 157:3	expectations	explicitly 89:2
41:15 79:6 95:24	evaluate 80:4	142:1	exposed 89:12
99:19	evaluation 80:21	expected 80:8	144:7
epidemiology	evans 1:21 5:24	100:12	exposure 88:15
85:17 89:5 95:19	153:4,20 154:3	experience 17:12	90:24 91:20 96:22
95:22 98:16 101:1	everyone's 144:15	21:23 27:3	97:8
equally 74:12	evidence 73:11	experienced 15:21	expresses 72:10
equivalent 73:12	89:19 150:1	65:7,13 66:18,24	extent 18:20 27:2
75:7	exactly 100:4	experiencing	31:16
errata 8:23 9:2,5	117:22 120:7	142:8	extracted 68:11
9:10 116:16,19	122:17 149:18	experiment	extrapolating
117:2,10 123:1,12	examination 4:1	143:24 144:11	105:22
155:13,18 157:7	8:2 146:18	expert 8:8,11	extremely 41:9
157:10,18 158:1	examined 148:24	10:13,19 11:4,21	90:6
error 121:11	example 20:20	17:1,7,13,19,23	f
errors 121:18	93:16 140:7	18:12,21,24 19:9	face 81:15 115:6
123:3,5,14	examples 100:11	35:2,3,6,22 36:8	fact 82:7 88:3
esquire 2:3,4,4,5,7	exceed 73:18	40:2,19 70:24	109:11 142:6,19
2:11,14,18,19 3:4	exceeded 71:9	82:21 86:6 147:3	factor 106:1,3,10
155:5	excel 118:4,5	147:4	106:22 107:12,17
essentially 124:11	119:3,6,15 122:3,5	expertise 33:7	108:3,8,24 109:10
establish 137:24	excerpt 72:9	53:19 59:18 60:5	110:8,24 112:12
established 149:15	excerpts 75:11	60:12,18 62:1	110:8,24 112:12
estimate 21:20,22	excess 83:9 86:20	63:11,17,24 86:18	114:5 116:9,10
22:5 48:16 77:2	87:15	101:7	factored 52:20,24
78:14,23 79:3,12	excessive 52:7,12	experts 39:24	factoring 116:8,12
93:10 94:8,9	53:4	52:15,21 53:1,7	factors 113:5
96:12,15 103:1		57:7 58:1 60:8	144:3
			177.3

Veritext Legal Solutions

factual 32:7	files 119:3 122:3	flow 118:23	former 109:16
fair 44:4,5 45:18		focus 21:5 35:14	
· ·	filing 152:3	focused 23:8	formula 23:3,4,7 141:13
145:18 150:2,5	filling 56:14		_
151:4,8	final 35:16,20	focusing 31:15	forth 8:19 9:5,11
fall 137:23	120:18	follow 90:7 119:19	9:22 153:15 154:6
falls 142:14,14	finalized 122:15	124:16 126:10	forty 153:15 154:7
familiar 64:23	financially 6:4	146:24	forward 135:13,17
103:22	153:14	followed 131:20	136:5 141:18
families 103:11,14	find 29:6,7 73:7	following 130:19	142:2 149:17
103:24 104:12,17	103:4 114:23	follows 7:21 8:1	155:15
104:20 105:9	130:24 155:11	13:23 62:23	found 73:11
106:7,10,17,19	finding 108:13,19	123:22 146:14	four 115:7,16
107:6 109:24	114:19	footnote 105:1	fourth 61:14 85:6
family 90:8 108:20	fine 13:13	110:5,5	franks 2:14 6:16
109:3	finish 41:7 60:23	force 16:9 148:23	6:22
far 9:20 21:12	finished 21:14	foregoing 153:5	free 156:14 157:20
34:4 72:5,12 74:3	144:17	156:13 157:18	front 116:20,21,24
99:17	firm 5:23 6:1,12	forensic 132:10,12	full 8:5 153:10
farther 10:23	6:21	133:21	function 63:5
fbi 125:17,23	firms 27:8 43:11	forget 151:16	69:21
fed 32:23,23	first 8:1 10:18	form 19:12 42:1	functional 70:4
109:19 119:15	11:3,21 12:10	46:9 47:8 48:15	further 7:16 51:16
federal 1:20	17:2 24:12 25:3	49:20 50:12,22	86:15 145:19
feeding 113:12	27:23 37:22 41:10	51:20 58:17 63:15	152:4 153:8,11,13
feeling 24:8	41:12 66:13 87:11	64:4,20 65:9,19	future 64:12
fellow 32:21	91:5 95:24 105:24	67:15,17 69:2,9,22	139:22 140:21
felt 111:7	106:4 110:8,24	71:16 79:14 81:17	141:10 144:13
fetus 89:12	112:12 113:21	82:5 83:23 89:13	g
field 11:10 101:24	114:5 115:19	91:22 94:5 95:18	g 5:1 7:23
fifth 85:7	121:3 124:12,21	97:10 98:24 99:6	gaps 128:4
figure 33:7 114:21	125:3,6 129:16	99:15 100:2	garcia 15:6 16:3,5
115:1 120:17,18	130:14 135:2	102:14,20 103:15	119:24 121:17
121:8	142:23 151:3	104:3 106:11	128:9,10
figured 21:1	153:7	107:1,8,18 108:10	gawd 105:20
figures 111:7	five 146:4 151:24	108:16,21 109:4	general 12:12 42:4
115:18 119:4,10	flavor 87:3	109:15 111:21	77:12 81:10 139:8
121:23	flip 34:21,22,22	112:17 118:3	generally 15:23
figuring 150:14	88:11	121:12,15 134:5	23:16 147:14
file 28:16,20	florence 87:4,17	138:13 143:14,20	148:16
filed 5:17 17:14	87:20 131:20	149:12 150:9	
	132:1		generates 86:11

geographic 132:16	gonna 22:19 26:2	harm 51:4 101:9	hmm 35:24
getting 46:3	43:8 65:21	101:23 117:3,10	hold 12:20 22:1
117:11	good 5:2 7:6 8:4,6	117:14 136:9	61:9
give 19:19 21:22	13:16 19:20 56:5	harmed 143:12	holdings 143:3
24:8 31:24 45:22	63:24 79:5 93:6	harms 44:7 46:20	home 109:12
61:1 62:1 95:24	96:3,20 135:19	46:23 47:1,10,17	138:10,11 139:2,4
101:14 110:14	goods 45:15	47:20 48:1,11	homes 141:4
112:1 121:18	gosh 74:15 122:16	50:7,9,18 51:13,17	hospice 65:18,24
124:15 137:8	gotten 22:18 105:9	52:6 54:15 55:2	66:5,10
given 86:10	greater 73:12,13	55:13,23 59:9	hour 19:15
151:23 153:17	gregory 8:6	124:4,20	hourly 16:17,20
154:10	greylock 11:6,13	head 44:4 107:10	20:11
gives 126:17	12:15,18 14:10,13	108:12	hours 10:21 19:17
glitch 11:2 28:7	14:22 15:5 16:13	heads 118:10,14	19:20,23 20:2,4,5
39:11 111:7 147:5	16:20 19:23 20:12	health 2:10 6:13	22:19 122:2
global 71:4	20:14 21:8 22:12	6:19 83:9 86:20	human 103:10
gma 22:6 29:13	123:7,9	87:15 103:10	104:11
go 5:11 6:14,15,15	ground 27:3	104:11	hungry 122:23
6:17 7:6 9:21	groups 120:2	hear 13:1 53:6	huntington 1:4
18:15 33:21 40:22	121:2	57:21	5:16 8:17 9:16
43:14 48:6 58:16	guess 15:2 22:7	heard 120:23,23	12:5 15:14 23:12
62:17 86:15 104:4	122:10 127:20	hearing 12:22	27:7 31:24 124:7
104:4 107:9 114:1	h	85:24	124:23 125:12
114:20 122:7	h 7:23	heat 32:21	134:13 135:6
123:17 127:13	hager 3:3 5:23	help 14:19 15:22	155:6 156:3 157:3
132:15 133:2	hand 30:8 119:13	15:23 63:12 64:11	hurst 2:5 7:4,4
142:2 143:23	153:17 154:10	70:4 97:4 99:4,13	i
144:5 146:7	handled 34:21	99:24 100:22	idea 64:6,10,16
goes 49:1 73:20	handwritten	helped 16:12	116:1,15 124:18
144:15	28:14,18,23 29:1	helpful 15:7 24:2,3	identification 18:5
going 5:3 13:24	hansen 25:8	26:17 57:7	identified 40:18
24:17 34:4 41:20	happen 21:13	helps 110:18	112:11 121:11
46:7 47:7 60:24	96:14	hereof 153:6	123:5,13 130:11
62:20 74:3,6 89:3	happened 120:15	heroin 93:16,17	identify 41:23
111:24 122:22	happening 129:24	hey 146:20	49:22 50:4 111:1
123:18 124:10	happens 15:14	high 115:7 124:15	128:15 133:16
131:14 132:24	21:15 90:7 122:5	124:18	150:20
135:13,17 136:5	happy 21:6	higher 113:9	ignoring 105:14
141:18 144:5,7,12	hard 12:21 31:20	hint 101:14	iii.d. 135:3
146:2,11 147:2	harder 131:5	hit 131:5	immediately 62:10
149:16	1141 UCI 131.3		immediately 02.10

[impact - keller] Page 13

impact 71:22	139:2,3	informative 112:1	101:11 112:16,20
111:12 134:8	increased 138:10	112:2	113:23 114:7
148:14	increasing 90:5	initial 125:11	121:3,4
impacts 31:13	independent 66:8	initiative 29:17	involves 125:15
implies 76:13	66:15 67:4,10	injury 64:8 69:8	involving 112:24
importance 26:24	68:1,14,20 69:5,11	input 57:8 66:7,15	ironed 42:7
32:3	69:17 70:7 79:2,9	67:3,9 68:5,13,20	issue 15:24 16:6
important 62:12	79:11 83:20 88:22	69:4,11,16 70:7	46:11 70:22 89:17
imposed 44:8	89:10,14	117:15,17 118:3,6	148:19
46:20 47:21 48:11	independently	118:22 119:9	issued 8:18 42:20
50:7,18 51:4 52:7	77:18 83:13	122:3	42:23
54:15 55:23 59:9	index 4:1	inputs 51:2 52:16	issues 13:22 16:1,6
impressed 122:11	indicate 150:20	53:9 57:15 67:24	16:7 50:24 52:3
impression 115:9	indicated 60:2,9	76:3 119:2,14	52:14 57:23 123:5
improve 69:21	60:14 61:15 74:14	122:3 147:15	j
70:4	74:18,21 152:2	151:5	j 2:11
improvement 63:4	indicating 155:13	insect 54:6	jack 15:20
inaccurate 118:17	indications 75:16	instructed 29:18	jackson 153:2
inadvertent	indirect 80:15	instructions	jan 25:7
120:16 121:7	indirectly 82:15	121:19	january 10:21
inappropriate	84:13 86:9 92:24	integrated 43:11	19:21 26:6,7
50:21 51:18 52:19	93:4,13 116:3	intelligence	job 51:24 52:16
incidence 125:16	individual 57:2,3	129:21 130:17	54:21 63:21
incident 127:24	57:9,14 123:10	intend 10:12	john 2:5 7:4,6
include 10:11	130:11	intended 41:24	johnson 25:8
144:24 145:14	individuals 26:9	interested 6:4 34:6	judgment 70:10
included 20:21,23	26:21 27:14 30:2	34:24 102:22	70:16,20 71:24
47:18 61:18 98:11	31:6,10,16,22 32:6	112:4 126:20	july 17:24 27:15
98:21 99:10	32:16	153:14	29:10 32:15
155:13	infant 88:18	interfere 5:8	justice 129:21
including 97:19	infants 90:23	145:24	130:17
98:4 111:14,16,17	91:13	interference 5:6	justified 56:23
150:23	influence 144:3	interpret 73:14	justin 3:4
inclusion 120:17	information 32:7	interrupt 43:14	k
121:7	32:15 41:17 81:15	122:20	
inconsistent 100:9	96:1 113:15	intolerable 53:12	kanawha 154:2
incorporated	125:19,22 126:5,7	53:15	kathy 147:4
157:12	128:5,12 132:11	investigate 68:7	kearse 2:4 7:13,13
increase 63:12,19	132:13 133:21	invoices 20:7	keep 125:5
69:14 136:15	141:20	involved 48:17	keller 2:8 7:8
137:19 138:11		98:12,21 99:11	146:22

[kessler - list] Page 14

	0.5.1.5.00.16.11.5.0	100 00 100 10	
kessler 2:14 6:21	85:17 98:16 115:9	103:23 108:18	led 86:14 119:20
6:21	116:1 120:2,19	113:5 115:9,11,11	left 58:22 89:5
key 34:23	125:15 126:17	115:15,16,17	legal 155:1 158:1
keyes 2:11 4:3	129:14 142:13	116:7 118:23	legitimate 58:13
6:11,11 7:1,12 8:3	149:19	119:2,7 120:20	lembke 36:5,9
13:2,7,9,16 14:5	kinds 139:6	122:2,3,4,5,22	38:12,15,18 71:1
23:24 30:18,23	king 17:15	123:10 126:8	71:14 72:9,22
31:4 35:12,20	knew 146:2	127:1 136:22	73:8,10 74:6,13,17
36:5,9 37:18,22	know 12:9,11,21	139:6 140:8	74:24 75:1,11,12
38:1,6,9 41:1,15	14:24 15:8,22,22	141:19,24 143:6,6	75:19 76:9,15,20
42:11,17 43:1	16:16,21 18:22	143:19 144:4,7	77:16,23 78:3
59:21 61:1 62:15	20:18 21:13,13,17	149:6,19 150:11	147:16 148:8
62:17 63:3 78:14	21:18 22:7,22,23	150:14	150:24
78:22 79:6,16,18	22:24 23:1,2 24:1	ko 2:7 4:4 7:6,8	lembke's 71:10,24
79:19,24 80:5,18	25:24 26:1,3,16,18	12:24 63:15 66:12	leslie 87:7 88:1
81:6,24 82:8	26:22,24 27:10	67:15 77:1 99:15	letter 155:19
83:18 84:2,3,6,10	28:3,4 29:6,24	100:2 134:5 143:1	level 22:8 26:18
86:6 89:3,7,20	30:4,10,24 31:8,9	143:14,19,23	45:17 51:17,19
90:21 91:7,12	31:11,12,21 32:4,5	146:5,7,19,21,22	52:9 53:11,13
92:10 94:22 95:10	32:18,20 34:10,15	151:10,19	54:1 57:2,10,10,14
95:11,14 96:4	34:19,22 35:24	l	57:15 71:15,15,20
98:18 99:18,21	36:4,4 37:24 38:8	labor 16:9	72:11,16,17 74:1
100:5,13 101:7	40:24 41:5,16,17	laboratory 132:10	86:5,12 97:2
114:10 117:12,16	41:19 42:2 43:10	132:13 133:21	106:14 113:10
117:16,18 118:7,8	43:12 44:19 45:24	laptop 28:15,17	124:15,18 128:23
118:11,16,23	46:10,13,14,16	30:8	132:16 137:3
119:2,10,14,18,19	48:9 49:10 50:14	large 12:5 74:2	140:15,17 142:1,4
119:22 120:3,16	50:15 53:15,16	75:17	lexecon 14:16,19
120:24 121:8,14	54:4,11 56:10	larger 85:1,7	licensed 58:14
121:24 122:14,24	57:12 59:17 62:7	law 6:11 27:6,8,8	98:7,13,22 99:13
123:17 124:2	69:24 71:17,21		99:24
133:14 134:3,18	75:14,16,17 77:4,6	27:11 125:13,21	life 60:15 61:16
145:19 146:6	80:11,24 81:1,2,9	126:10 128:6,11	63:20 82:18,22
147:1,4 149:12	81:20,20,21 82:13	128:15 129:6	limitations 103:6
150:9 151:12,17	83:24 85:22 86:3	130:12	line 52:18,22 53:2
kids 102:9,16,16	86:12,17 87:20	lawful 56:6,10 59:11	53:10,22 61:14
115:7	89:14,24,24 90:2,7		122:20 155:13
kind 15:20 22:7,14	91:7 93:14 95:23	lawsuit 82:23	157:7 158:3
32:1 45:23,24	97:1,2,12,12 99:8	lead 115:5	link 135:2 139:1
46:11 63:17 80:21	99:9 100:7,13	learn 23:16	list 23:9,19 24:22
81:19,21 84:20	101:7 102:2,6,23	leas 125:20 132:1	27:13,15 33:13,14

[list - measure] Page 15

33:22 35:2,3 40:1	110:18 115:1,3	102:1 103:7	mcginness 2:4
49:5	132:3,6 133:2	105:24 108:14	mcguire 1:19 5:14
listed 27:21 31:5	138:14 139:7,8,14	111:15,17,19	8:4,7 9:15 14:3,6
31:16 34:1 38:2,5	looked 10:20	114:14 115:24	18:20 43:1 63:2,4
39:3 40:11 42:18	30:12 80:7,14,23	116:7	122:23 123:24
43:2,18,24 49:15	81:16,18 87:21	manage 99:4,14	124:3 146:16
117:10,13 157:7	103:2 137:2,4	99:24 100:22	151:13,17,23
157:17	139:10,15	manifest 150:12	153:5 154:5 155:8
listing 157:7	looking 34:18 39:8	manufacturer	156:4,9 157:4,13
lists 25:6	39:20 74:15 79:23	44:20 45:7,15	158:20
literature 136:20	81:13,24 130:9	46:1,8,17	mckesson 7:1 43:9
137:23 138:23	137:1	maps 32:22	mckinnon 11:6,14
149:1	looks 97:24 98:9	march 23:19 25:3	12:15,18 14:10,13
litigation 14:18	147:6	25:13,14 27:14	14:23 15:5 16:14
15:21 17:12	lot 33:18 82:13	28:9 29:10 32:14	16:20 19:23 20:12
little 6:17 20:17	lots 100:7	37:23 38:4 41:12	20:14 21:9 22:12
24:17 73:22	louder 86:2	41:13 42:4,17	123:7,10
107:19 111:4	lower 111:8 112:2	market 49:10	mean 12:4 18:16
119:13 122:9	113:16 131:4,13	141:4,8 142:8,21	26:12 33:5,19
142:16	142:9	142:22 144:3	36:14 44:15,24
live 110:8 111:1	lunch 122:21	marshall 15:15	45:1,19 70:15,19
112:13 113:22	123:20 146:4	mart 43:11	77:12 78:18,21
114:6	lyn 25:7	mass 87:22	84:20 85:5,6
llc 154:4	m	material 26:2	92:20 93:8,13,18
llp 2:8	m 7:23,23	32:20 34:11	94:1,3,7 102:2
local 6:20 23:17	macro 57:10,15	109:19,21	107:12 112:8
24:13 27:2 80:13	71:15,17,20	math 142:3	119:12 138:16,18
89:16,19,21 103:6	madam 155:10	mathematical	146:2
126:1 143:4	magic 119:6	85:11	meaning 97:17
located 1:21	144:12	mathematically	98:4
logan 2:20	magnitude 80:7	86:3	meanings 44:18
long 58:22 72:11	maintained	matter 5:15 12:14	means 45:13,14
72:19 117:22	125:17	14:9 20:15 21:11	53:16 92:21 93:3
121:22 122:2	majority 90:16,16	21:15 31:7 34:17	93:9,14,20 94:6,8
longer 122:9	90:18,22 100:6,10	36:24 53:18	107:13
look 9:18 23:23	maltreated 102:5	matters 22:24	meant 56:11 92:21
24:4 30:24 34:23	102:12,17,19	53:7 67:3 69:16	measure 66:4,9,22
39:4 51:24 52:17	103:4 112:6 115:8	mayor 25:7	67:6,11,19 68:2,8
52:17 73:2 80:19	115:20 116:13	mccann 36:13,16	68:15 69:6,13,19
81:2 97:13 102:18	maltreatment	36:19,22	70:3 76:21 77:18
104:5 105:1 107:9	101:10,12,22,23		77:22 149:10
	101.10,14,44,43		

[measure - net] Page 16

150:7	microphones 5:4,8	100:21,21	129:21 130:17,20
	midwest 155:17	motley 2:5 7:3,5	130:23 131:12
measurement	158:1	7:11	132:10,12,23
	mike 7:2 30:18	move 24:17 26:18	133:20
/	mind 26:23 104:23	45:6 46:1	nationally 88:4
mechanism 62:12	146:8,9	movement 44:19	nature 31:12
	minus 77:3	46:16 70:4	41:17 55:11 86:13
	minute 51:23	mt 2:6	necessarily 125:23
	minutes 31:22	multiple 43:12	145:3,16
medical 31:23	62:17 129:3 146:4	137:3	necessary 119:1
	missed 30:4	multiply 114:7	140:23
	missing 46:14	multiplying 83:8	need 24:6 28:5
medically 60:2,9	105:11 126:12	101:10	53:16 56:24 57:4
	mistake 120:19	mute 7:19 13:14	77:6,10 94:14
	mixing 39:6	146:9	110:16 141:24
	mobility 63:12	mysterious 20:17	142:2
24:10 25:6,17,18	69:15	21:3	needed 29:19 41:4
26:8 27:24 31:15	model 116:1	n	92:14 96:1 123:6
41:14 42:16	modifications 9:6	n 5:1	129:12
meetings 23:10,15	modified 122:8	n.w. 2:12	needing 7:19
24:12,15 25:1,17	moment 146:5,10	name 5:22 8:5,6	needle 144:7
26:17 27:4,6,18,21	money 21:6	15:17 44:3 155:6	needs 141:16
28:9 31:18 32:5	months 42:9	156:3,4,15 157:3,4	negative 149:4
42:14	morbidity 16:11	157:21	neglect 102:1
meets 153:15	83:3,7 92:22 93:9	names 15:11,12	neighborhood
154:5	94:17,19 96:15	narrative 122:8	144:5
member 123:9	114:8 120:4 121:3	narrow 46:11	neither 153:11
mental 81:21,23	147:22 148:7	nas 88:9,18,23	neonatal 88:9,14
-	morning 2:18 5:2	89:6,8,11 90:5,12	90:22
mentioned 75:13	6:18 7:7 8:4,6	91:12,19,21 92:9	net 12:3 46:23
merit 1:21	147:2,8	92:11,14 93:23	47:10,11 50:14
	mortality 78:10	94:1,12 95:1,15	51:4,8,9,12,13,14
method 111:4	120:13,14 121:4,6	96:6,10,18,21 97:7	51:24,24 52:6,17
00	mother 88:19	97:17,22 98:2,11	54:14,15,22 55:13
41:11,14 87:21	92:15 94:2 96:23	98:20 99:10,21	55:22 59:19 70:22
102:6 112:11	97:9 98:12,22	100:6,8,19 101:2	71:5,6 75:8 76:4
115:5 129:2	99:12,22 101:1	nation 88:5	76:11,13 77:3,3,4
· · ·	mother's 96:18,18	national 26:19	77:5,9 112:5
132:2,3	97:23	27:1 89:19 113:10	125:1 149:3,10,15
michael 2:3 155:5	mothers 67:13,21	112.12 10 125.15	149:15,21
	96:10,11,13	113:13,19 125:15	

[never - okay] Page 17

never 16:15 17:6	84:4,7,11 88:23	objected 86:2	october 153:17
new 58:17 117:11	89:6,8 90:12 92:8	objection 10:7	odd 82:1,16 143:8
118:1,6	92:10 94:11	19:12 29:23 37:3	143:9
nibrs 126:15 128:1	101:10 102:4,9,12	40:21 45:20 48:15	offender 139:7
128:3,13,19 129:5	102:15,15,17	49:9 50:3,12,22	offer 10:12 71:14
130:11	105:23 110:12,13	51:20 52:11 55:6	72:22 74:13
night 144:6	110:21,22,23	56:4,16 57:1,20	134:10
nir 126:15	112:5,7,8,11	58:24 59:13 60:4	offered 41:3
non 55:20 73:11	113:13,19 114:4	60:11,16 61:23	120:22 150:23
84:24 97:20	115:18,19 116:13	62:6,13 63:8,14,22	offering 17:7
130:16	120:11 124:7,22	64:4,9,14,20 65:2	18:12 19:9 31:18
nondrug 127:2,9	125:9,11 126:6	65:9,15,19 69:9	55:12
127:22	130:10 133:17	70:5,12 75:5 76:2	offhand 136:24
nonfinal 121:8	134:20,21 149:1	76:10,23 77:1	officer 11:9
nos 5:19	151:23 155:7,13	78:2 79:14 81:8	offices 27:7,8,11
notarized 155:14	numbers 79:15,17	81:17 82:5,11	official 156:15
notary 153:4	79:19,23,24 80:5	83:23 84:17 85:10	157:21
155:24 156:10,18	80:17 81:7,10,11	87:18 91:22 92:4	oh 7:6 25:24 31:7
157:15,23 158:23	81:14,22,24 82:8	94:5 95:18 96:24	40:5 41:12 45:12
note 5:4 28:4	84:1,1,16 85:16	97:10 98:10,14,24	62:7 79:10 105:20
30:24 151:14	86:11 94:21 95:9	99:6,16 100:2,3	122:16
155:12	98:19 102:7 111:9	102:14,20 103:15	ohio 155:2
noted 7:16 28:22	111:23 112:1,3	104:3 106:11	okay 9:9,13,22
notes 27:17,19,20	114:9,19,24	107:1,8,18,23	10:15 14:22 15:18
27:23 28:11,14,14	116:14 117:11	108:4,10,16,21	16:8,17,23 17:11
28:18,23,24 29:4	118:1,3,6,11,16,22	109:4 111:21	18:3,8 19:7 20:3
29:11,14,16,18,21	119:2,18 122:8	113:1 121:12,15	20:10 22:4 24:6,9
30:7,11,15,19	157:7	138:13 142:11,24	24:19,20,21,23,24
153:9	0	143:18 149:12	25:12,22 26:8
notice 1:20	o 5:1 7:23	150:9	27:12,17 28:1,6,13
noticed 126:2	o'connell 25:7	objections 6:8	28:18,24 29:4,6,8
noticing 6:10	oath 6:3	obtain 125:11	30:1,23 31:4
nuisance 9:15 12:1	object 22:2 42:1	obviously 79:16	32:13 33:10,19
12:2,7 17:2,2,8	46:9 47:7 48:1,4	occasion 30:12	34:1 36:13,16
18:6,13,13 19:10	49:20 53:14 58:15	99:3	38:4 39:20,24
32:2 53:24 54:3	63:15 67:15 69:2	occur 25:19 27:5	40:10 41:10,22
54:10	69:22 85:21,23	82:1,6 97:18 98:3	43:18,24 44:6,12
number 15:1	86:1 89:13 109:15	occurred 25:13	44:15 45:8 46:5
19:20 22:15 33:13	112:17 134:5	28:9	48:10 49:16,22
35:2 78:14,23	143:14,20	occurring 88:3	50:6 51:3,15 52:5
79:3,12 83:8,13,21			52:18,22 61:7,13

[okay - overall] Page 18

61:20 62:3 66:9	100:16 126:14,15	54:10,16 55:3,9,15	141:3,17 144:24
70:15,19 72:9,15	138:21	55:24 56:3,13,22	145:1,2,13,14,16
73:4 74:7,23	ooo 152:6	57:17 58:4,11	147:11 148:15,21
75:22 78:13,22	open 124:10	59:5,11,12,23 60:2	149:2
79:19,23 81:5,23	operator 5:2 7:15	60:9,14 61:14	order 56:15
82:7 83:20 84:3	13:4,11,19,24 14:2	62:11 63:5,12,19	148:24
84:22 87:1,4	62:20,24 123:18	64:2,7,11,17,24	organize 15:22
88:13,22 89:7	123:23 146:11,15	65:6,12,17,24 66:5	organized 15:7
91:7 92:8 93:2,7	151:21	66:10,18,23 67:7	original 9:6,9
94:20 97:13,16,22	opinion 52:16	67:12,20 68:3,9,16	117:20 118:17
98:20 101:17,18	55:12 62:1 71:11	68:23 69:7,14,20	originally 28:17
101:21 102:18	71:13,14 72:22	70:3,23 71:22	79:20
103:13,23 104:6	74:13 76:11 90:1	72:1,2,12,19,23,24	orthopedic 68:18
104:10,15 105:3,4	90:16 134:10	73:13,22 74:11,14	oud 83:8,10,14,21
105:8,16 106:15	opinions 8:19 9:11	74:18 75:2,3,3	84:4,7,11,23 86:7
106:21 107:11,22	9:23 10:12 17:7	76:5,7,22 78:5,15	86:21 87:15 95:3
109:8 110:2,20	18:12 19:9 31:18	78:18,19,24 79:4	95:5,12 96:7
111:14 114:4,12	41:2 52:16 77:4	79:13 80:15 82:3	100:6 101:6
116:23 117:2,9,21	150:23	82:4,9,10 83:9,14	133:12 147:22
118:5,9 120:22	opioid 14:18 47:3	83:22 84:8,12,13	outcome 6:4 22:9
121:17 122:18,24	61:20 62:3 73:11	84:24 85:1 86:9	63:17
123:12,16 124:10	82:20 83:1 90:24	88:16,19 89:12,18	outcomes 18:6
124:14 125:8	93:11 94:9 96:11	90:10,13 91:20	outlining 26:1
127:23 128:14	96:13 97:18 98:3	92:12,16,17,19,24	outside 43:1 60:5
129:4 130:3,6,10	98:6 99:4,12,23	93:1,3,4,5,8,12,17	60:12,16,18 61:24
130:20,24 131:22	100:19,21,22	93:19,21,23,24	62:8,14 63:8,10,16
132:6,12,18,22	101:2 111:12,16	94:3,10,13,16,18	63:23 64:5,10
133:3,11,16	113:13 114:8	95:2,3,6,12,15,16	65:2,4,16,21 86:18
134:22 135:8,11	116:3 131:17	96:6,8,14,19,22	91:23 92:1,6
135:21 136:14	133:5,6,7,23,24	97:8,19,23 98:4,13	97:11 128:21
137:11,14 138:2,7	134:1 135:13,18	98:22 101:4,11	outweigh 71:11
138:24 139:19	141:22 147:22	112:16,20,24	72:1,5,12,24 74:3
141:8 142:18	148:11	113:7,9,23,24	76:12 77:24 78:7
143:24 144:19,21	opioids 12:3 44:9	114:7,9,15 115:8	149:4,16
145:10,11 146:10	44:16,19 45:6	115:21,24 116:1,9	outweighed 75:9
148:6 150:5,18,19	46:6,16,21 47:3,12	116:10,11 124:5,9	75:24
151:9	47:15,22 48:12,23	124:24 127:6,6,11	outweighing 72:19
once 38:24 122:3	49:6,17,19,23 50:1	127:17,18,19	outweighs 75:2
141:19 148:1	50:8,10,15,19 51:5	130:13,15,16	overall 80:8 113:3
ones 34:1 35:21	51:11 52:2,8,10	132:4,8 134:9,11	135:4 142:1,4
43:1 54:18 79:15	53:4,5,12,24 54:2	135:4 140:9,20	

Veritext Legal Solutions 888-391-3376

overestimate	78:10 84:22 86:24	71:15 93:11	107:1,8,18,23
115:11	91:2 94:24 97:13	patient's 64:3,7	108:4,10,16,21
overly 113:5	97:16 101:15,16	69:14,20 70:4	109:4,15 111:21
overview 124:15	101:19 110:14,16	patients 58:13	112:17 113:1
owned 144:1	124:14 130:1,8	65:7,14 66:1,5,11	121:12,15 122:19
owner 144:14	131:19 134:18,22	66:19,24 68:24	134:16,19 138:13
154:3	135:1 137:9,14	71:18 147:10	142:11,24 143:18
owners 142:7	138:21 139:1	pausing 46:11	145:22 151:14
р	144:19 145:6	payment 21:18,23	155:5
p 5:1	150:17,19	peaked 80:12	pending 143:20,22
p.m. 123:19 124:1	parents 107:14,14	pediatrician 90:5	people 12:21 15:2
146:12,17 151:22	park 144:8	pendell 2:3 6:14	20:19 24:13 26:20
pa 2:21	part 15:1 21:3	7:2,2 10:7 12:20	31:23 32:19 58:5
page 17:12 23:20	23:21 24:11 30:12	13:6,8,10,12 18:15	68:4,10,17 116:2
24:4,5,22 27:12,22	33:23 34:6 45:5	18:19 19:12 22:1	143:4,8 144:1
33:9 38:2 39:10	52:4 54:24 55:18	23:22 24:1 29:23	people's 141:24
44:6,13 61:9,11	83:2 89:2 124:21	30:22 31:3 37:3	percent 22:19
79:21 83:4 97:13	124:21 125:3,7	40:21 42:1 45:20	42:23 82:2,8
145:9 155:13,15	141:11 157:9	46:9 47:7 48:4,15	90:10,12,18,19
157:7 158:3	participate 30:1	49:9,20 50:3,12,22	92:11 94:11
pages 12:10 30:19	63:20	51:20 52:11 53:14	100:18 103:21
34:20,20	participated 23:11	55:6 56:4,16 57:1	114:13 129:8
paid 19:14 21:1	participating	57:20 58:15,24	130:14 134:12
143:16	23:14	59:13 60:4,11,16	135:12,17 136:2
pain 59:22 60:3,10	particular 15:24	60:22 61:3,11,23	136:15 137:19
60:15 61:15,21,22	16:6 24:10 36:2	62:6,13,16,19 63:8	140:10,16,21
62:4,9,12 64:12	54:19 55:19 70:21	63:14,22 64:4,9,14	141:3,15,16,19,21
65:7,13 66:18,23	95:17 107:17	64:20 65:2,9,15,19	142:2,5,5 144:13
67:13,21 68:4,10	108:3,9 109:10	69:2,9,22 70:5,12	percentage 20:24
68:17,24 72:12,19	131:5 139:6	71:16 75:5 76:2	21:2,17 22:23
73:1,1,12 74:14,19	147:16	76:10,23 78:2	23:1,2 89:11
75:1,1,1,12 /4.14,19	particularly 72:4	79:14 81:8,17	90:17 94:1 110:7
palliative 64:18	parties 1:21 5:11	82:5,11 83:23	111:1 112:15,20
65:1 67:7	48:9 153:12,14	84:17 85:10,21	112:23 113:21
paper 136:20,21	partition 56:19,20	86:1 87:18 89:13	129:13,18 130:21
papers 137:23	58:8,18 59:14,16	91:22 92:4 94:5	131:8 132:7 133:4
149:14	parts 124:20	95:18 96:24 97:10	133:7,18,22 134:1
paragraph 12:13	party 6:3	98:10,14,24 99:6	136:16 137:20
14:8 44:13 60:20	passed 11:11	99:16 100:3	138:9,11,17 140:5
61:4,8,10 72:3,4,7	patient 63:13	102:14,20 103:15	141:5,6
73:9,24 74:7,8,16	64:11 69:7 71:15	104:3 106:11	
/3.7,27 /7./,0,10			

4 04.20	1 57110610	02 2 00 7	50.22.62.11.62.5
percentages 94:20	place 5:7,11 26:19	92:2 99:7	59:23 62:11 63:5
102:8 134:2	44:22 54:24	positive 76:4,13	64:24 65:6,12,17
percents 141:15	142:23 153:6	149:5,15	65:24 66:5,10,18
performed 148:13	placebo 73:23	possible 26:3 98:9	66:23 67:12,20
148:18 150:21	plaintiff 1:5,12	post 60:10 61:16	68:3,9,16,23 69:7
151:6	52:15	62:11	69:14,20 70:3,23
performing 32:8	plaintiff's 147:4	potential 71:6	71:22 72:1,2,23,24
33:3	plaintiffs 2:2 7:3,5	148:10,20 150:12	74:10 75:2,3,3
period 47:4 48:20	7:9,11,14 8:12,13	potentially 86:8	76:5,7,22 78:5,15
51:10 52:2 122:1	8:15,16 10:13	92:5	78:17,19,24 79:4
125:14 126:19	14:18 27:9 29:2	precisely 129:23	79:13 80:15 82:4
134:13 135:6	35:23 40:3,19	predict 141:14	82:10 83:9,14,22
136:6	145:22 146:23	predominantly	84:8,12,13,24 85:1
person 23:19	pleasant 2:6	89:17	86:9 89:18 90:9
24:10 25:6,18	please 5:4,6 6:9	preexisting 99:5	92:17,19,24 93:1,3
26:8,17 27:4,6,20	7:17 8:5 65:11	99:14 100:1,23	93:4,5,8,12,17,19
28:9 31:15 42:13	110:14 116:22	pregnancy 88:20	93:20,24 94:2,10
42:16 93:14 101:1	138:15 140:12	92:16 94:3 99:5	94:15,18 95:2,3,6
person's 63:19	155:11,11	99:14 100:1	95:12,16 96:6,7,14
personally 156:11	point 10:15 15:17	pregnant 99:4	96:19 97:23 98:7
157:15	20:1 40:17 42:2	premise 59:3	99:12,23 101:3,11
personnel 23:11	43:17 54:22 60:22	prepare 34:12	113:24 114:8,15
perspective 49:13	70:23 71:23	prepared 9:10	115:8,21,24 116:1
49:14 64:12 78:6	112:10 115:16	17:13	116:11 124:5,9,24
pharma 17:15	122:21 136:16	preparing 30:13	126:22 127:11,19
pharmacies 58:13	137:20 141:5	32:16	130:13 133:7,12
phenomenon	145:20	prescribe 99:3	134:1,9,11 135:4
85:15	pointing 104:23	prescribed 96:23	135:13,18 140:9
philadelphia 2:21	points 41:23 141:6	97:9,19 98:5,13,22	140:14,20 141:2
phone 105:14,18	pope 137:15,15,17	99:13,23 100:22	141:17,22 144:24
155:3	137:18 138:5,5	prescription 12:3	145:1,2,13,14,16
phones 5:7	139:10,10,14,15	44:9,16,18 45:6	147:10 148:10,14
phrase 45:9 48:2	141:20,20	46:6,21 47:2,3,12	148:21
physician 58:7	population 72:11	47:15,22 48:12,23	prescriptions 57:4
98:7,13,23 99:13	72:16,17 74:1	49:6,16,18,23 50:1	58:6,14,21 116:4,6
99:24	portfolios 143:4	50:8,10,15,19,19	127:7 135:2
physicians 58:14	portion 55:13	51:5,11 52:2,8,10	present 3:2 6:5
99:3	portions 11:18	53:5,12,24 54:2,9	presume 149:24
pick 5:5 54:22	34:15	54:16 55:3,9,15,24	pretty 19:20 72:6
pieces 12:11 16:12	position 56:5	56:3,13,22 57:17	74:9 87:23 96:20
	63:18,24 65:5,22	58:4,11 59:4,10,12	134:7

	150 (20 151 5	10.10	I
previous 22:24	150:6,22 151:7	provide 12:18	q
67:2 92:22 118:22	professional	14:13 32:6 41:18	qualified 153:5
previously 59:15	154:17	65:11 67:12,20	quantification
95:9	professor 8:4 9:14	68:3,9,16,23 73:12	41:24 47:17 59:1
primarily 71:1	9:14 14:6 18:20	79:6 104:20 116:4	98:12 99:11
87:14,19	37:18,22 38:1,6,9	126:11 132:13	139:19
primary 15:5 88:1	41:15 47:9 61:4	provided 18:21	quantified 50:7
150:20 151:6	61:11 63:4 79:6	32:20,21 57:7	51:3 55:14
prior 10:22 11:12	79:16,18,19,24	71:4 79:16 107:5	quantify 54:14
14:17 25:17 35:7	80:5,18 81:6,24	129:20	68:22 76:21 77:18
89:22 118:9,15	82:8 83:18 86:6	proviso 44:2	77:20 82:22 87:15
private 5:5	89:2,7,20 90:21	proximate 145:1,3	97:5 138:9 139:1
privilege 31:1	91:7,12 92:10	145:15,17	148:9
probably 10:23	94:22 95:10,11,14	proxy 112:23	quantifying 46:19
25:21 29:7 34:4	96:4 98:18 99:18	150:7	47:1 54:18
39:3 41:12 42:3,7	99:21 100:5,12	public 9:15 12:1,2	quarter 136:15
91:24 102:21	101:7 114:10	12:6 17:2,8 18:5	137:20 141:5
105:19 109:6	117:12,16,18	18:13,13 19:9	question 13:1
110:4 111:8	118:7,8,11,16,23	31:23 32:2 54:10	18:22 19:4 32:10
136:23 146:3	119:2,10,14,17,19	153:4 156:10,18	45:22 46:4,12
problem 13:1 14:7	119:22 120:3,16	157:15,23 158:23	47:8 48:7 51:22
15:23 61:3,3	120:24 121:8,14	pull 24:2,3 102:3	53:6,17 54:4,8
96:11,13	121:24 122:14,22	102:11	56:7 57:21 63:18
procedure 1:20	124:3 133:14	pulled 103:10	70:1 71:5 77:14
64:3 69:8 156:5	134:3 151:13,17	purchased 142:10	79:8 81:10 85:12
157:5	properly 64:2	purchasers 142:20	85:14 89:4 94:14
proceed 90:14	properties 142:7	purdue 17:14	95:19 97:6 100:24
proceeding 6:9	142:20,23 144:4	purport 101:9	102:10,24 108:23
proceedings 7:21	property 134:10	114:13	102:10,24 108:23
13:23 62:23	136:10,16 137:5	purported 77:17	126:20 143:20,22
123:21 146:14	137:21 138:1,22	purpose 23:14	149:8
process 45:5,24	139:11,16,20	88:2 153:6	
127:20,22 134:6	141:14,21,22	purposes 41:18	questioning 122:20
processes 86:16	142:9,10 144:1,9	67:24	
produce 119:4	144:14,15	pursuant 1:20	questions 61:2 67:2 70:14 71:2
produced 119:16	proposition 75:23	58:6,13 97:23	75:24 89:1 98:16
producing 122:4	76:16,20	98:6	
production 155:15	protective 104:1,7	purview 51:1	100:16 115:14,23
155:17,22	106:23 107:4	put 28:16,17	145:20,21 146:1
productivity	proven 64:18,21	116:21 139:17	146:24 147:13,21 150:16 151:13
148:15,23 149:4			150.10 151:15
ĺ ,			

[quick - relief] Page 22

	1.42.0	146.21 147.10	10.12 10.0 52.10
quick 138:14	143:8	146:21 147:19	18:12 19:9 52:18
quickly 119:8	realm 57:5 77:15	148:1 151:21	57:8 83:21 86:20
122:6,11	realms 77:14	157:9	132:13 147:1
quite 26:22,22	realtime 154:3,17	recorded 5:14	150:21 151:7
95:23 114:18	reason 31:2 87:24	recording 5:10	registered 1:21
quote 12:14 14:9	93:16 100:14	19:20	154:17
18:5 44:7 61:14	117:13 141:8	records 10:20	regular 97:18 98:3
73:10 74:8 90:22	155:14 157:8	19:19 20:8	reinforced 26:23
91:11 97:17 112:8	158:3	redactions 30:19	relate 27:2
quotes 32:19 73:3	reasonable 52:9	30:21 31:1	related 6:3 34:17
r	52:12,23 53:3	reduce 140:9,15	126:24 127:2
r 5:1 7:23	80:2,6,21 81:16	reduced 153:10	128:16,22 131:16
rader 25:7	84:19 113:2 136:2	reduction 59:22	131:17 133:4,5,6
randomized 64:22	136:4 149:10	140:13 141:15,16	133:19,22,23,24
rate 16:18,20	150:6,13	reed 2:19 6:24	135:13,18 140:14
20:11 95:24	recall 15:17 17:3,8	refer 20:18 43:10	141:22 148:10
111:19 133:12	17:16 23:12 36:8	45:4 46:5 137:15	149:7 153:12
139:23 141:10	36:10,10,15,24	reference 17:24	relating 34:7
rates 137:4 139:16	37:12 42:13 43:17	98:1 110:17 138:7	relation 71:6
ratio 110:20,23	81:11 100:4 104:5	138:8,20 155:7	74:11 75:17 113:9
113:13,17	136:24 138:17	156:2 157:2	150:15
-	147:11,17	referenced 11:12	relationship 138:9
ray 6:22	receipt 155:18	72:7 137:9 138:16	139:15 149:2
raymond 2:14 read 33:16,18,23	receive 20:11,12	139:1 156:11	relative 153:13
	21:8 22:19,21	157:15	relatively 119:8
34:2,5,8,13,16,24	23:4 94:21 118:14	referred 89:21	reliability 100:17
35:7,10,12,16,18	received 21:8,12	referring 11:13	reliable 77:4
35:20 36:3 78:8	22:11,14 30:18	26:6 45:10,11	reliance 88:2
84:18 91:9 135:9	118:10 122:13	46:7 72:10 89:22	148:8
151:15 152:3	128:14 129:5,6	109:22 138:19	relied 28:4 32:7
153:10 156:5,6,12	receiving 118:9,15	refers 46:16 120:8	33:1 57:14 66:6
157:5,6,17	recess 62:22	reflect 85:16	66:14 67:2,9,23
reading 75:15	123:20 146:13	reflected 10:8	68:12,19 69:4,10
91:1,2 109:19	recollection 39:12	80:18	69:16 70:6,10,16
155:19	40:23	reflecting 139:20	76:19 77:15 79:5
ready 41:5	record 5:3,12 6:7	refresh 39:12	83:17 89:5,20
real 26:19,19	7:18 8:5 10:21	74:16	90:1 95:11 96:3
111:9 112:8	13:22,24 14:4	regard 52:22 53:2	103:9
really 16:16 63:10	16:15 62:18,20	87:22 125:10	relief 62:4,12
63:24 64:5,15,23	63:1 123:17,18	regarding 7:19	67:12,21 68:3,9,16
65:4,21 91:24	124:1 146:11,17	9:15 13:21 17:7	68:23 73:12 75:7
97:12 99:7 107:3	12	,	00.20 70.12 70.7

[relievers - right] Page 23

	22 16 10 24 24	107.2	•• •
relievers 61:21	32:16,18,24,24	reporting 107:2	responsible
rely 32:15 33:2	34:8 35:7,18,20	113:15 125:16,19	134:12 135:5
70:18,19 71:24	36:17,20 37:2,6,11	126:9 127:24	rest 111:11 131:6
78:13 87:14,17,19	37:14,19 38:7,10	reports 31:24 35:2	result 56:14 57:4
95:24 137:17	38:13,16,21 39:14	35:3,6,10,19,22	97:22 98:6 114:12
relying 31:17	39:18 40:2 41:3,8	36:1,8 40:1 60:6	117:11 124:4
71:10,13 75:10,12	41:18 42:20,22	78:8 80:13	138:6 139:21
75:18,21,22 76:3,8	44:6,7,23 45:3	representing 27:9	resulting 47:1
76:11,14,17,17	46:19 48:21 51:1	request 11:11	results 122:5
77:22 78:3,22	53:9 55:17 57:8	128:8,11 153:10	retail 44:20 45:16
90:21 95:14	60:21 61:5,18	157:9,11	45:16 46:2,8,18
147:14	70:22 71:23 72:4	requested 104:12	retained 18:23
remember 28:22	72:8 73:7 75:19	126:5 128:5,12	151:24
29:19 30:4 36:6	75:20 77:7,20	requests 11:10	returned 155:18
41:20 43:3,23	78:9 79:21 83:4	104:8	returning 32:13
89:24 90:4 102:22	83:19 84:3,6,10,22	require 108:13,19	review 36:1 74:23
102:23,23 103:5,8	86:24 87:13 88:10	required 155:24	81:19 131:7
104:9 120:7	90:20 91:3,10	requirements	149:14 155:12
122:17 131:3	92:1 95:1,10	153:15 154:5	156:1 157:1
134:20 137:2	97:14,17 101:8	research 65:23	revise 121:19
remembered	108:5 109:22,23	66:3,17,20 83:13	revised 118:1,2
28:22	110:2,3 117:20	83:21 88:22 89:10	122:15
remind 67:16 74:5	118:1,12,17,24	89:15	revising 118:11
129:24	119:11,16 120:4	residential 144:1	rice 2:5 7:3,5,11
remotely 1:21	121:20,23 122:7	residents 84:4	right 8:13 9:17,20
5:22 6:6	122:15 124:10	resolved 21:14	13:6 26:1 39:6
renee 11:5 15:6,18	125:23 126:8	respect 12:2 15:9	41:7 42:21 43:23
20:9,20	129:24 134:17	33:5 36:11 50:24	44:14 47:14 51:7
repeating 67:16	137:1,8 138:8	52:3 54:5 70:13	51:21 70:11 71:21
replaced 70:18	144:20,22 145:9	74:9 83:18 86:7	73:6 77:9 79:8
report 8:18,21,24	147:20,23 148:2	92:22 103:7	86:19 87:5 88:10
9:7,9,13,14,22	150:17	111:14 127:21,22	88:16 89:15 91:10
10:1,4,8,11 11:16	reported 106:18	128:24 136:10	91:16 92:17,18
11:19 12:10,13	126:1,3,15,16	148:7 149:23	95:7,20 96:23
14:8 15:9 16:1,6	128:13,20 129:8	respects 88:5	99:2 102:10 104:5
17:1,11,13,19,24	133:13	responded 147:14	107:20 110:4
18:17,22,24 19:14	reporter 1:21 5:24	response 45:21	112:13 114:18
20:10,20 22:18	7:17 154:17,17	48:7 147:13	117:4,7 129:10,15
23:9,23 24:3,4,7	156:7	responsibility	131:17 132:2,17
24:18 25:20,22	reporters 154:3	48:8	133:9 134:15,20
27:13 30:13 32:2	•		136:17,18 141:1

[right - severe] Page 24

148:3	saith 152:4	section 16:11	sensitive 5:5
risk 75:17 106:1,3	sale 47:2,11 50:7	24:24 67:22 70:21	sent 19:22
106:10,22 107:11	50:18,21 51:4,10	78:9 83:3 117:3	sentence 44:12
107:16 108:3,8,24	52:1,9 53:3,4,23	124:3,11 130:2,8	61:13,17 74:17
109:2,10,13 110:8	54:1,9,23 55:8,11	134:8 135:3	91:5 97:16 101:18
110:24 112:12,24	55:14 56:2 59:10	147:22 148:2,6	131:23 132:9
113:4 114:5 116:5	59:11 78:18,21,24	sections 67:14	138:5 151:3
116:7	79:4,13 134:9	117:3 147:20	separate 38:4
risks 72:11,18	sales 44:8,15,21,24	security 24:8	40:14 47:20 48:10
73:13,16 74:3,10	45:1,9,16,24 46:5	see 18:6 24:24	51:16 52:5
97:2	46:13,20 47:4,21	25:9 26:18 27:15	separating 48:18
risky 75:7	48:11 50:20 51:18	32:5,17 33:14	separation 100:20
rite 43:11	51:19 52:7 53:11	34:22 35:4 36:8	september 1:21
rmr 153:20	54:16 55:24 56:12	44:10 46:15 61:13	5:3 20:1 153:17
rocky 25:8	56:19 59:4 124:8	61:17 78:16 80:1	154:10 155:4
rohrback 2:8 7:8	133:8,13 134:1	81:1,13 85:3,4	sequelae 83:11
146:22	144:23 145:13	97:20,21 101:18	series 23:10 24:14
role 15:18 21:4	saved 28:19	103:5 111:24	27:13 70:13 119:3
42:5,5 48:16	saw 16:15 80:24	114:24 115:7,16	servants 31:23
49:11	saying 25:12 77:24	118:24 130:18	served 16:24 17:6
roles 43:12	93:2 115:19	135:1 137:14	18:11 19:8
root 68:4,7	135:23 143:12	141:11 142:3	service 132:11,13
roughly 20:4	says 19:14 22:18	145:5,10 150:19	133:21
80:10 117:21	61:14 72:5 84:11	seeing 34:19	services 103:11
row 85:6,7 115:19	97:17	104:24	104:11
rpr 153:20	sc 2:6	seek 104:6	serving 8:8,11
ruby 2:14 6:22	scientifically	seen 30:15 60:6	11:3
rules 1:20 156:5	57:19 59:24 63:6	segment 50:16,17	set 67:2 75:16
157:5	scope 11:22 18:3	51:16 52:5 55:8	79:20 118:2 122:4
run 81:21 84:20	60:12,17,18 62:14	74:2	123:1 153:15
running 6:17	63:9,10 65:3	seizure 113:15	154:6
rushnawitz 11:5	91:23 92:1,6	seizures 112:20	sets 9:5,11,22
15:6 20:9	97:11	131:24 132:4,5,8,8	setting 8:18 26:3
rushnawitz's	seal 156:15 157:21	132:14	65:1 148:7
15:18 20:20	seattle 2:9	sell 143:16	settings 64:19,22
S	sec 74:6	seller 50:4 142:16	67:7 83:1
s 1:21 5:1 7:23	second 44:12	sellers 49:16,23	seven 15:3 35:3
153:4,20 155:15	97:16 121:3,6	selling 45:17 50:10	153:15,15 154:6,7
157:8,8 158:3	123:1 145:7	sense 19:2 36:14	severe 60:2,9,14
safety 144:5	seconds 24:18	41:4 42:4 80:16	61:15 62:4
		81:2,4,5,14	

[sex - statistics] Page 25

-			
sex 139:7	sincerely 155:21	100:15 113:11	squarely 101:6
share 28:24 85:1,7	single 120:5	sound 12:22 13:3	staff 12:15,17
92:16 93:22 94:9	sir 155:10	13:5 114:18	14:10,12,16,22
94:17 95:1,3,5,12	sitting 108:18	sounds 9:20 13:11	16:13 20:13,18
95:15 96:6,7,12,15	situation 23:17	13:19 64:21 91:6	21:9,10 22:13,20
96:18 102:16	54:12 81:20	119:12	23:1 42:8 118:21
113:3 126:21	situations 62:5,10	source 102:4,11	119:21,23 123:7,8
127:14,16,18	100:7	103:1 106:13	123:9 126:4 128:5
131:15,17 132:4	six 15:3	120:12	128:8
140:19 141:2	size 80:9	sources 31:14	standard 31:9
shares 49:10	skipped 146:3	81:15 88:1 103:21	standpoint 144:23
sheet 8:23 9:2,5,10	slow 6:17 34:8	128:2	150:11
116:16,19 117:2	small 75:16	southern 1:1 5:18	start 41:8
117:11 123:2,13	smith 2:19 6:24	speak 36:16 37:1	started 25:19,24
155:13 157:7,10	36:6,11 38:20	37:10,13,18 38:6	26:15 92:8 125:24
157:18 158:1	39:13,17,22	38:12,15,20 40:2	127:23 128:3
shipment 45:15	social 86:16	40:14 42:16	starts 78:10 83:4
shipments 56:19	society 87:10	speaking 40:6	state 6:6,9 8:5
shipping 56:14	sold 46:18 47:16	specific 41:23 42:4	17:14 18:4,9
shocked 122:11	49:19 50:1 55:3	91:15,18 102:10	19:11 111:6,11
short 62:4,9 122:1	56:22 57:17 58:4	102:18 103:3	132:19,21,22
146:3	58:11,21	131:1,8 132:7,18	153:1,4 154:1
shorthand 153:9	solutions 155:1	139:5	156:10 157:15
show 88:6 114:13	158:1	specifically 89:23	statement 46:24
128:22,23	solve 15:23	128:10	64:21 73:15 74:20
shown 155:16	somebody 27:7	specified 153:6	76:4 85:5 90:22
side 53:19 77:5,17	somewhat 45:5	spend 16:14 23:18	91:8,11 98:1
77:21	soon 26:3	spent 22:19	100:5,10 105:3
sign 151:15	sorry 6:17 14:6	spoke 37:23 39:13	140:2,3 143:21
signature 153:19	15:11,16 16:21	41:1 42:13	144:17 156:13,14
154:16 155:14	18:16 39:9,15	spoken 36:19,22	157:19,19
signed 156:13	43:14 54:6 61:8	37:5,8,16 38:9,18	statements 10:1,2
157:18	62:1 65:10 69:24	39:17,21 42:19,22	73:8
significant 64:12	70:6 86:23 97:12	sponsored 87:10	states 1:1 5:18
74:10	103:8,20 105:14	spreadsheet 118:4	103:17,18 104:2
significantly 73:13	108:22 114:16	118:6,10,15,19	statistic 130:20,21
73:17,18	123:8 126:23	119:17 122:13	130:23 131:1
signing 155:19	127:3 130:7	spreadsheets	statistical 82:18
similar 67:1 87:23	135:22 143:2	119:15	82:22
124:18 131:1	sort 12:22 63:17	square 2:20	statistics 26:19
	80:24 89:19		

[stay - ten] Page 26

146.0	25 17 22 26 17 20	20.0.26.7.20.5	4.1 . 5 11 22 2
stay 146:8	35:17,23 36:17,20	28:8 36:7 39:5	take 5:11 23:2
staying 146:10	37:2,6,11,14,19	41:16 42:23,24	27:17,19,20,23
step 112:14 124:11	38:7,10,13,16,21	43:13,16 46:3	28:10 29:10,14,16
125:11 127:5,20	39:14,18 40:2	49:21 61:1 62:19	29:18,21 30:7
127:21 129:16	116:16 122:16	65:10,12,12 67:17	39:4 55:1 60:23
133:5,10,11 134:6	submitting 35:7	67:19 73:20 84:19	62:15 81:5 88:2
stepping 86:18	123:12	85:20 88:12 92:7	88:19 110:18
steps 55:1 127:7	subscribed 156:10	99:1 100:14	113:13 114:4
127:12 129:1	157:14 158:21	101:16 105:1	115:3 121:22
130:14	subsequent 28:2	107:21 108:1,17	144:12 145:7,23
steve 25:7	42:8,10	109:5 117:22	148:3
stop 34:24 86:19	subset 20:19	121:13,16 122:24	taken 1:19 5:14
story 21:14 54:22	120:14	122:24 124:13	53:8 58:5 62:22
strategy 13:15,16	substance 93:15	132:17 133:1	83:19 96:22 97:8
street 2:12,15,20	substitute 118:21	145:9 146:6	97:19 98:5,6
144:8	subtle 46:15	151:15	123:20 124:19
strike 59:21 82:13	suffered 67:13,21	surgery 61:16	130:16 146:13
82:15	68:10,17,24	62:10,11 68:18	153:6,9,13
strong 140:4	sufficiently 12:5	69:1	takes 34:20 44:22
structure 33:6	suggest 36:3	surgical 60:10	122:9
structuring 32:8	suite 2:8,20 155:2	64:3 69:8	talk 19:1 119:21
32:11 33:3	sum 71:17	surprised 80:11	124:17 127:8
studies 86:21	summaries 34:12	suspicious 56:15	146:4
87:14,20 88:7	summarized 134:7	swear 7:17	talked 59:14 73:24
138:7,8,16,19,20	summary 17:12	sworn 7:22 8:1	talking 72:14,18
138:24 149:1,6,23	93:6	153:7 156:10,13	125:5
149:24 150:1,3	summit 16:23 17:5	157:14,18 158:21	task 50:23 77:2
study 87:4,7,9,17	18:9 19:10	syndrome 88:10	139:7
131:20 136:24	superior 17:15	88:15 90:23	tasks 15:8 16:5
137:2,3,15,18	155:1	system 58:23	taylor 3:4
139:10,14,15	supplement 151:5	125:16 128:1	team 119:9 121:14
stuff 35:14,15 90:7	supplied 79:20	t	tease 51:16 52:6
147:1	80:5 82:8 118:5	t 7:23	teeth 68:11
subject 12:1,12	support 12:6	table 32:12 79:20	tell 16:21 30:20
34:19 66:21 68:6	20:14 21:10 22:13	79:23 80:18 81:1	41:22 91:10 99:2
69:3 89:15	60:7 73:9 90:20	81:18 85:6 92:22	105:19 107:9
subjects 34:21	98:1 138:22	95:8 114:23,24	120:1 130:4
submission 117:20	suppose 86:15	115:3,18 120:17	132:24 134:22
submit 20:7,9	92:6	tables 26:4 94:19	tells 77:5
submitted 8:23	sure 21:16 23:24	119:4,16	ten 62:17
9:2 17:18 18:24	24:15 25:15 26:12		

[tends - turn] Page 27

tends 11:9 21:13	37:9,17 38:8,19	16:13 20:8,20	126:17 134:12
teresa 1:20 5:24	39:23 44:17 45:4	23:18 31:20 37:24	135:5,12,17
153:4,20 154:3	46:11 47:13,18,18	39:13 40:3 41:6	136:15 137:19
term 45:3 49:11	51:12,22 52:13	47:4 48:20 51:10	140:19 141:2
62:4,9 72:11,19	53:16 54:21 55:7	52:2 62:21 63:1	151:23
89:15	56:6,18 59:14	66:13 82:13,16	totally 109:5
terminal 65:8,14	60:13 71:18,21	105:24 106:4	tower 2:15
66:19,24	72:3 74:7 78:10	110:8,24 112:12	trades 15:21
terms 32:7,10	80:7 81:18 86:18	113:21 114:5	transcribed 156:7
44:23 45:19 52:13	96:17,20 102:2,21	122:1 123:19	transcript 153:10
52:14 80:8,14	104:8 106:14,16	124:1 125:14	153:14 154:5
111:12 122:2	106:17 109:6	126:19 143:17	155:11,12 156:5
125:1 140:4	113:2,8 117:19	146:12,17 148:3	156:12 157:5,11
150:15	118:13,24 122:21	151:18 153:6	157:17
terrible 90:8	125:17 130:23	times 37:21 38:23	transcripts 33:14
test 84:15,20	131:3,11,23 136:1	70:9 142:5,5	33:17,18,23 34:13
testified 8:1 17:1,5	142:12 143:8	timing 80:10	34:16
testifying 8:8,11	145:18 147:8	title 9:17	trauma 60:3 61:16
10:13,19 11:4	150:13	titled 9:13 24:24	traumatic 61:22
16:24 17:7 18:12	thinking 113:12	117:3,6	travis 15:13 16:8
19:8 40:19 82:21	third 2:8 133:5,10	today 147:8	treat 73:1 75:4
testimony 17:3,9	133:11	150:24	77:7
151:22 156:6,7	thirty 155:18	today's 151:22	treated 126:23
157:6,9,12	thomas 1:19 8:6	todd 25:9	149:17,17
thank 44:5 134:19	9:14 153:5 154:5	told 31:17 40:24	treating 58:7
151:10,17,20	155:8 156:4,9	121:17	147:10
thankfully 119:6	157:4,13 158:20	tolerable 53:11	treatment 57:19
thanks 62:16	thompson 36:6,12	tom 5:14 14:3	83:10
151:19	37:10,13,16	18:15 63:2 123:24	trending 140:7
thing 44:21 45:10	thought 46:10	146:7,8,16,20	trial 73:21
72:6 92:21 113:11	84:18 89:17 90:5	150:16 151:11,23	trials 64:22
122:12 142:13	125:10 143:24	top 44:4 107:10	tried 115:23
things 13:15 23:16	144:11	108:12	try 55:7 76:21
26:20 28:22 32:1	three 2:20 12:11	total 15:1 19:23	126:23
32:23 44:24 45:5	30:18 36:5 86:21	20:3 22:24 47:10	trying 31:8 45:8
45:11,14 97:3	127:12,21 129:1	48:16 50:23 51:24	47:14 54:6 85:19
111:16 144:9	130:13 133:1	52:17 54:9 55:17	109:8 114:23
think 16:2 25:24	134:6	56:8,17 57:22	115:10,15
26:17 29:13,18	threshold 50:11	58:8,19 59:19	turn 5:7 24:21
30:5 31:7 32:17	time 6:9 10:15	85:2 110:11,12,21	33:9 60:20 86:24
32:24 35:13 36:23	12:22 14:1,4 15:1	110:22,23 125:12	144:19 150:16

888-391-3376

[turned - vs] Page 28

•			C
turned 122:12	67:17 70:1 76:8	151:2	versus 5:16 17:14
turning 29:8 78:9	77:23 85:9,22	useful 64:18	50:20 51:18 52:8
83:3	109:5,8 119:19	uses 107:15	53:4,12 54:1
twelfth 2:12	125:2	128:19 133:11	59:11
twenty 153:15	understanding	utero 88:15 90:24	victims 101:11
154:6	23:6 43:5 49:1,3	91:20 96:22 97:7	105:24 106:4
two 23:21 24:11	50:13 70:24 71:19	V	110:8,24 111:1
24:18 25:13,16	74:24 88:17,21	v 155:6 156:3	112:12,15 113:21
45:11,14 75:21,22	90:19 109:9,16,18	157:3	114:5
76:18 87:14 117:3	120:15,20 125:20	valuation 18:5	video 5:2,10,13
120:2 121:2	understood 11:24		7:15 13:4,11,19,24
124:20 126:23	120:9	82:17 117:4,10,14 value 82:18,22	14:2 54:7 62:20
127:7,20 129:2	undertake 58:9,18	101:9,22 125:1	62:24 123:18,23
type 23:5 30:8	67:4 76:21 130:24	138:12 139:3,4	146:11,15 151:21
typed 28:19 29:1	131:7	138.12 139.3,4	videoconference
types 86:7	undertook 133:16	141:4 142:3,8,14	1:19
typewriting	133:17	142.13,21,22	videographer 3:3
153:10	underwater 12:23	values 134:10	5:24
typewritten 30:19	unequivocal 71:8	136:11,16 137:5	videotaped 1:19
typo 120:10	unit 5:13 14:2 63:2	137:21 138:1,10	view 70:23 72:10
typographical	123:24 146:16	138:22 139:11,16	72:15
117:6 123:3	united 1:1 5:18	139:20 141:8,14	virginia 1:1 2:15
u	units 151:24	141:21 142:9	5:19 6:20 9:16
u 7:23	unlawful 56:2,2,6	144:10	15:15 48:24 49:7
u.s. 91:12,17	56:10 59:6,10	variation 111:18	49:17,24 51:6
129:20 130:16	unmute 13:15	varies 21:4	54:17 56:1 102:7
ultimate 94:14	unquote 112:8	various 27:14	102:17 104:7,13
145:3	unreasonable	31:22 50:16	104:20 105:10
ultimately 46:17	52:23	103:17,18 116:7	106:21,24 107:5,7
46:17 127:11	update 121:19,23	126:9	107:12 110:13,22
unacceptable 58:1	updated 119:10,18	vastly 71:8,11	111:20,23 112:1
undercount	use 41:24 44:23	72:1,23 73:7,17	113:4 131:2,5
111:23 126:13	45:3,9 49:11 53:8	venture 17:2	132:19 153:1,16
149:21	82:17 88:6 93:20	veritext 5:23 6:1	154:1,7
undergone 67:22	94:9 96:11,13	152:1 155:1,7	virtually 30:5
underlying 85:17	97:18,23 98:3,4,6	158:1	visit 37:23 38:4
113:11 150:1	98:19 100:19,21	veritext.com.	voluntary 125:20
understand 8:14	101:2 102:7 106:3	155:17	vs 1:6,13
8:16 11:22 28:8	113:19 116:3	version 29:1,1	
	120.6 141.14 20		
36:7 42:15 45:8	138:6 141:14,20	35:16,18,20	
36:7 42:15 45:8 48:17,21 52:14	147:22 148:11	35:16,18,20	

[wa - zoom] Page 29

w	weigh 148:21	words 34:23	91:1,4,6 98:9
wa 2:9	weird 13:12	work 10:8,9,18	99:16 106:20
wait 41:7 61:8	welfare 101:24	15:7,24 16:4,5	114:1 115:4
	103:16	18:8 20:15 21:10	117:22 121:10
waiting 85:23	went 10:20 15:15	22:13 30:13 34:17	130:9,19 131:11
waived 155:19	99:1 104:10 126:3	41:8 42:6 59:3	137:13 141:7
wal 43:11 walk 124:6 144:6	126:4	79:2,9,11 86:13	145:6 147:6 150:3
	west 1:1 5:19 6:20	148:22 149:2	year 10:21 120:5,5
waller 36:5,9 37:1	7:7 9:16 15:15	worked 16:7,9	125:23 136:6
37:5,8 75:13,15,20	48:23 49:7,17,24	19:17 20:19 79:16	years 84:23 85:8
76:9,15,20 77:16 77:23 78:4 147:16	51:6 54:17 56:1	83:24	104:17 105:4,6,10
148:8 151:1	102:7,17 104:7,13	working 12:15	105:12,22 120:14
wand 144:12	104:20 105:10	14:10 63:20	121:9 126:2
want 6:15 21:22	106:21,23 107:5,7	workplace 148:15	135:20,23,24
22:1 39:4 47:24	107:12 110:13,22	150:6,21 151:7	136:4 137:4
60:23 67:17 73:20	111:19,23 112:1	works 16:21 118:8	yield 141:21
113:5,6 122:19	113:4 131:1,4	worried 144:14	Z
124:16 125:5	132:19 153:1,15	worrying 144:6	zach 25:8
129:22 143:4	154:1,7	worse 111:6,10,11	zero 77:8 149:17
145:23 151:14,15	whispering 5:5	142:17	zip 139:11
wanted 18:19	wholesale 48:22	write 11:16,18	zip 139.11 zoom 3:4 5:22
57:12 88:6 96:12	49:6,19 50:1	25:22 90:2	11:2 28:7 39:11
131:16	wide 132:19,22	writing 9:11 25:19	111:7 146:9 147:4
washington 2:13	williams 2:12 6:12	written 8:18 17:22	111.7 140.7 147.4
17:14,15 18:4,10	25:8	36:8 58:6,14 98:7	
19:11	wisdom 68:11	153:9	
wave 144:12	wit 153:2 154:2	wrong 39:16 82:1	
way 35:24 36:15	withdrawing	120:11 140:2	
46:1 56:18,20	140:8	145:6	
61:24 71:21 73:14	withdrawn 140:15	wrote 17:23	
77:13 86:18 94:18	witness 7:17,22,24	wv 2:16 153:20	
99:8,9 111:8	153:7,10 155:8,11	X	
142:17 143:7	156:1,4,11 157:1,4	x 22:19	
ways 73:15	157:15	-	
we've 60:24 96:15	witnesses 29:9	y 22.10	
96:19 109:22	witness' 155:14	y 22:19	
116:8 122:21	woman 99:4	yeah 6:16 9:4	
wealth 143:2	word 48:1,5 73:7	12:24 17:23 18:2	
weeds 99:17	90:17 151:2	18:19 24:3 26:7	
117 10 10	wording 65:11	39:11,15 49:10	
week 117:19,19	O	61:10,12 70:2,13	

Federal Rules of Civil Procedure Rule 30

- (e) Review By the Witness; Changes.
- (1) Review; Statement of Changes. On request by the deponent or a party before the deposition is completed, the deponent must be allowed 30 days after being notified by the officer that the transcript or recording is available in which:
- (A) to review the transcript or recording; and
- (B) if there are changes in form or substance, to sign a statement listing the changes and the reasons for making them.
- (2) Changes Indicated in the Officer's Certificate. The officer must note in the certificate prescribed by Rule 30(f)(1) whether a review was requested and, if so, must attach any changes the deponent makes during the 30-day period.

DISCLAIMER: THE FOREGOING FEDERAL PROCEDURE RULES

ARE PROVIDED FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES ONLY.

THE ABOVE RULES ARE CURRENT AS OF APRIL 1,

2019. PLEASE REFER TO THE APPLICABLE FEDERAL RULES

OF CIVIL PROCEDURE FOR UP-TO-DATE INFORMATION.

VERITEXT LEGAL SOLUTIONS COMPANY CERTIFICATE AND DISCLOSURE STATEMENT

Veritext Legal Solutions represents that the foregoing transcript is a true, correct and complete transcript of the colloquies, questions and answers as submitted by the court reporter. Veritext Legal Solutions further represents that the attached exhibits, if any, are true, correct and complete documents as submitted by the court reporter and/or attorneys in relation to this deposition and that the documents were processed in accordance with our litigation support and production standards.

Veritext Legal Solutions is committed to maintaining the confidentiality of client and witness information, in accordance with the regulations promulgated under the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act (HIPAA), as amended with respect to protected health information and the Gramm-Leach-Bliley Act, as amended, with respect to Personally Identifiable Information (PII). Physical transcripts and exhibits are managed under strict facility and personnel access controls. Electronic files of documents are stored in encrypted form and are transmitted in an encrypted fashion to authenticated parties who are permitted to access the material. Our data is hosted in a Tier 4 SSAE 16 certified facility.

Veritext Legal Solutions complies with all federal and State regulations with respect to the provision of court reporting services, and maintains its neutrality and independence regardless of relationship or the financial outcome of any litigation. Veritext requires adherence to the foregoing professional and ethical standards from all of its subcontractors in their independent contractor agreements.

Inquiries about Veritext Legal Solutions' confidentiality and security policies and practices should be directed to Veritext's Client Services Associates indicated on the cover of this document or at www.veritext.com.